

THE MONTH

APRIL, 1948

Vol. CLXXXV EIGHTY-FOURTH YEAR

No. 969

CONTENTS

COMMENTS	<i>By the Editor</i>	Page 193
CATHOLIC TOLERATION IN MARYLAND	<i>By J. Crehan</i>	205
CONTROVERSY IN THE CATHEDRAL	<i>By J. Gilliek</i>	216
JESUS CHRIST IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ...	<i>By B. Leeming</i>	224
CARDINAL ALLEN'S ADMONITION	<i>By L. Hicks</i>	232
MISCELLANEA		243

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.

Mahatma Gandhi.

Christians and the Arab League.

II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES.

REVIEWS	249
---------------	-----

1.—The Death of Socrates. An Interpretation of the Platonic Dialogues: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito and Phædo. By Romano Guardini. 2.—(1) St. Francis of Assisi: the Legends and Lauds. Edited and annotated by Otto Karrer. (2) Les Fioretti de St. François d'Assise: a new translation by Fr. Godefroy, O.F.M.Cap. 3.—Our Lady of Light: an English version of Le Meraviglie di Fatima by Fr. G. Da Fonseca.

SHORT NOTICES	223, 242, 253
---------------------	---------------

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.

6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1

EDITORIAL OFFICES:

114 Mount Street, London, W.1

MANAGER'S ADDRESS:

Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.15, to which Annual Subscriptions, 20s., post free (U.S.A. \$4.50), should be sent.

TWO SHILLINGS NET

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

THE MONTH

A Catholic Review, conducted by the Jesuit Fathers, and edited
from : 114 MOUNT STREET, LONDON, W.1.

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & Co., LTD.
6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1

THE MONTH WAS FOUNDED IN 1864, and among its earliest contributors were Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Newman. Newman's well-known *Dream of Gerontius* first appeared in its pages. It is now in its 84th year.

IN JANUARY, 1947, IT RESUMED MONTHLY ISSUES, after the restrictions of the war years. There will be

ELEVEN ISSUES EVERY YEAR

The July and August issues appearing together as one holiday number.

THE MONTH provides articles :—

ON SPIRITUAL AND RELIGIOUS SUBJECTS.
CATHOLIC THOUGHT.

MODERN PROBLEMS AND THE
BACKGROUND OF MODERN EVENTS.

Recent Contributors include the following :—

Most Rev. T. Roberts, S.J. (Archbishop of Bombay), Fathers C. C. Martindale, R. H. J. Steuart, James Brodrick, Maurice Bévenot, Bernard Leeming, F. C. Copleston, Leo Hicks and John Murray, S.J.

Also :

Rt. Rev. Mgr. R. A. Knox, Christopher Dawson, Arnold Lunn, A. C. F. Beales and Halliday Sutherland.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

(From January, 1947) : £1 per annum (*eleven* numbers, post free).
Individual numbers : Two Shillings each (plus postage).

Orders and Subscriptions to : THE MANAGER,
MANRESA PRESS :: ROEHAMPTON :: LONDON, S.W.15

THE MONTH

VOL. CLXXXV

APRIL, 1948

No. 969

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

The Message of Eastertide

THE note of Easter and Eastertide is one of triumph. The Church records and commemorates Christ's victory over sin and evil and death. And this victory of Christ has been secured for all time; never can it be effectively questioned or challenged. "Christ, once dead, dieth no more," but is risen from death in radiance and glory. The return of the "Alleluias" to the Church's liturgy marks the transition from grief to joy, from compassion to mutual rejoicing.

Each year, as Eastertide recurs, it is timely to emphasize the immense importance of the Resurrection. For it was the crucial argument which Christ Himself threw down as a gage before His enemies and critics to substantiate His mission and teaching. It formed the central theme of the earliest apostolic preaching. The essential qualification of the new apostle, to be chosen in place of Judas, was that he should have been a witness of the Resurrection. It was the most cogent proof of Christ's mission and of His Divinity.

But it was and is more than an argument and a proof. It was both the symbol and effective sign of the *new life* of supernatural grace, of that new and privileged association of man with God, to which the victory of Christ opened the way. Again and again, in his epistles, St. Paul dwells upon this double aspect of the Redemption: the death to the older and vicious and sheerly natural life, in relation to the death of Christ upon the cross; the rebirth, the emergence to this new and loftier condition of living, in union with the Resurrection of Christ.

"Behold, I make all things *new*." How fittingly, and with what magnificence of achievement, has this sentence from the Apocalypse been realized through that first Easter Day! How fitting that this magnificent realization should be recalled and reflected on and borne steadily in mind throughout this Eastertide!

A Christian Note of Optimism

AT this present juncture of history, so heavy laden with fears and insecurity and with the consciousness of human problems of such complexity and urgency, it is all the more necessary that we should

retain this Easter mood in the background of our minds. Our Christian outlook is one of *optimism*. This is no naïve, but a moderated and a mature, optimism. It burns with no noisy spluttering but with a quiet and steady flame. Nor does it imply that everything will come right in the end, so far at least as earthly problems are in question. This optimism does not remove the need for activity, nor depreciate the value of sacrifice. It calls for both ; it demands a genuine and generous effort on our part to lead a thoroughly Christian life ; it insists that we appreciate more fully and defend with greater earnestness those Christian beliefs, ideals and standards which are so radically and ruthlessly attacked to-day.

The first and most immediate Catholic answer to world problems lies not in organization nor in counter-propaganda but in the reality of a Catholic life. The seriousness of the world situation at the present time ought to be a sharp and continual spur to spiritual activity. Christ on one occasion warned His disciples that a certain kind of devil could be cast out only by prayer and fasting ; and these remain the spiritual weapons of the Christian. For the Christian struggle is not merely with men of flesh and blood on a battlefield of purely human considerations ; it is with the powers of darkness that wield their influence through false and pernicious ideas, and find their human agencies and instruments.

Eastertide is a reminder of the great need for a personal religious and spiritual life. It summons man back to the thought of God, to the realization that the final purpose of human living can be discovered only in an individual direction of thought and effort towards God, the first beginning of man and his ultimate end, and in an honest endeavour to live according to the manifest and expressed Will of God.

In days as critical as our own, it is more than ever necessary that Catholics be prompted by this renewed memory of Easter to make more active and dynamic their own religious lives, and to value with a far more intimate appreciation their membership of the Catholic Church. Only so can they face the problems of the day with that conviction and courage which are now called for in so high a degree. Only so will they be able to provide the stiffening and leadership so requisite in the present struggle to save our civilization so sorely threatened—a civilization which, for all its faults and abuses and extravagancies, is based, in the last resort, on fundamentally Christian notions of man and human society.

A Task for Catholics in Britain

THERE is one particular responsibility at the moment, which Catholics in Britain may well feel is incumbent upon them. This is to make their fellow-countrymen understand the reality of Catholic ideas in the minds of a great part of the peoples of Western Europe.

The alliance with France and the three associated countries of Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg brings Britain into close, and be it hoped permanent contact, with lands in which Catholicism is a highly significant factor, and a factor which makes itself felt in public life. Holland no doubt ranks as a Protestant country, but the Catholic percentage of the population is nearly 40 ; the Dutch Catholics are fervent, well organized and influential. Wide as may have been Catholic and Protestant divergencies in Holland, it was by common political action between the Catholic and Protestant parties that religious education was secured. The remaining Western European countries, with which Britain will be brought into ever closer relationship, are all Catholic in tradition and religion.

It is important to bear in mind that, if Europe can be rebuilt through a Western Union—the advantages of which later can be transmitted to the East-Central peoples of Europe, at present cut off by the Soviet “iron curtain”—this reconstruction will be brought about through a society of largely Catholic countries, which will pool their resources and engage in mutual assistance. If the present alliance be broadened, as of course it must, then Portugal and Italy will be members : also, it is to be trusted, Spain. Now the people of Britain do not, in the main, understand Catholicism ; still less do they appreciate the influence of Catholic belief and principles upon the social and political life of countries that are in the Catholic tradition. They have never quite grasped the significance of parties like the *Mouvement Républicain Populaire* in France, or the Christian Democrats in Italy. The epithet of “clerical” or the label “clericalism” show this. If co-operation between the Western peoples is to be complete, and not to remain on the exterior terrain of material assistance, then it is imperative that the British people learn something of the significance of this Catholic influence. Here, I maintain, Catholics in Britain have a clear-cut task, and a splendid opportunity.

To a Catholic, it is quite a natural development that Catholic countries—or, to put it more generally, countries which have been formed in the Catholic tradition—should be the nucleus for this European revival. Europe cannot be understood without a reference to its formative centuries, its experience of Christendom under the presiding moral influence of the Catholic Church. The religious break-up of the sixteenth century was already an abandonment of the unity of Europe. In fact it would be easy to find parallels between the European situation of to-day and that of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when success attended the disruptive movement of Protestantism on the European Continent largely because it was aided and abetted by two Protestant Powers on the fringe of the Continent, namely England and Sweden. Nor is it without historical significance that the main Protestant areas of the Continent are playing little part, and indeed *can* play very little part, in the reconstruction of Europe at

the present time. Protestant Prussia lies prostrate, after bedevilling the rest of Germany with its ideas and policies of aggression ; while the Protestant Scandinavian countries are prevented from any too close association with Western Europe because of their proximity to Soviet Russia.

It is therefore important that members and representatives of the British Government should understand that they are dealing with peoples in Europe, unready to accept their Socialist terminology, and this for the reason that they have older and sounder principles. This Government has been sadly misled by the belief that the expression "Socialist" means always and everywhere the same thing. This was the reason for much illjudged, and at times unfair, support of the Social Democrat party in the occupied zone of Germany. Socialism in Britain, in all but the extreme Left wing of the Labour Party, and Socialism on the Continent, are very diverse conceptions. And Socialism on the Continent is now either a declining political force or is going over to the Communist enemy. In France, for instance, the position of the Socialists is far weaker than before. In Italy, the main section of the Socialist Party, under Signor Nenni, is making common cause with the Italian Communists.

The differences between so-called British Socialism and the genuine Marxist Socialism of the Continent has been made more evident still in the late crisis in Czechoslovakia : British Labour ministers and Trades Union representatives have roundly condemned the Socialists of Czechoslovakia (as of Hungary, Bulgaria and Roumania) precisely for this reason, that they have played the Communist game and have surrendered themselves, and whatever principles they may have had, to the Communists. It should be understood by now that Continental Socialism is half-way to Communism.

The need for Leadership from Britain

THIS need for an understanding, in Britain, of the Catholic tradition of Western European countries is heightened by the position which Britain may expect to occupy in any Western Union. Continental peoples look to Britain for just those qualities which they see reflected throughout British history : qualities of stability and tradition, a certain conservatism, a respect for older things and values. These qualities they find instanced in the retreat from Dunkirk and the long and unflurried stand against Nazi aggression throughout the years 1940 and 1941. Rightly or wrongly, this is the picture of Britain that they have and which they appreciate.

Britain, it must be confessed, has not manifested these traits conspicuously since the close of the war. And we have to face the unpleasant fact that rarely has the prestige abroad of any victorious nation dwindled so speedily as has that of Britain in the past three years. The general impression of post-war Britain, now so widespread, may be

wrong, but the impression persists. The British preoccupation with home economic questions has something to do with it, as also has the evidence of weakness in foreign policy, particularly in Palestine. Nor has the situation been helped by the speeches of some Labour ministers and members of the Left fringe of the Labour Party in the House of Commons. The language of modern Socialism does not ring with the British tones they know, and want, in the ears of Western European peoples.

A Warning

IT is not easy for one generation to rid itself of the leading ideas of its predecessor, however shallow and misleading those ideas may have been. One such idea favoured by the late Victorians and Edwardians was that of "progress." The world is improving by some natural law; men are growing more humane, more enlightened, more healthy year by year; science and education and hygiene are building a fairer world: so ran the cheery optimism of three and four decades ago.

This notion of progress was understandable enough when one recalls the rapid growth of scientific invention, and the immense industrial development of the nineteenth century. But it was a naïve belief, and was based on the assumption that material advancement was identical with progress. Men confused this material betterment with human improvement; they equated comfort with civilization; they measured progress by the speed of travel and the spread of sanitation. Education and scientific enlightenment would breed better generations—that was the theory of the modern prophets. Frequently they suggested this new enlightenment was to involve the banishing of old "superstitions," including morality and Christianity in their traditional and more insistent forms. Nothing has been so disproved in the twentieth century as their rosy belief in inevitable progress. Our century has seen crimes and barbarities far exceeding those of any previous era of man's experience. Savagery has been made into an instrument of human government; and it has been, and is, the savagery, not of primitive and unlettered creatures but of cold-blooded scientific men. The atomic bomb is at once a commentary upon this crude belief in progress (for progress it is, but what a progress!) and a warning of the perils of a material development with which moral education, and the sense of human responsibility, do not go hand in hand. Material advance has been stressed without a corresponding emphasis upon moral responsibility; with the result that criminal men have employed this material advancement for the most immoral and inhuman ends. And, at the same time, these men have created for themselves new codes of "morality," or immorality, by which they have justified their outrageous use of material power for bestial purposes.

What emerges from this sorry picture—and here is the great indictment of this generation—is that men cannot be saved, neither can

Europe be reconstructed, by material means alone. Not by bread alone doth man live ; nor will Europe begin to live again merely by the Marshall Plan. That Plan is important, highly important, for it might be added that man cannot live entirely without bread. But the bread is not sufficient. Nor will material prosperity by itself restore the vigour and the health of Europe. Prosperity alone will not revive the morale and refresh the spirit of Western Europe, not even of Britain.

The Western democracies require a more solid faith in that democratic system of life which they claim to be defending against Communism. Communists have their faith, even though as a faith, it be purely destructive. Democrats have too long been content with the advantages of a form of government which leaves them so full exercise of their rights and liberties. They have reaped the benefits of democracy without shouldering its burdens, and without realizing that democracy will be preserved only where democrats are determined to defend it ; and this not merely in periods of open war. The inevitable looseness of a democratic system has permitted men to think in terms of their own advantage, and not in terms of the commonweal ; has allowed class to agitate and manœuvre against class ; has tolerated the activities of enemy agents, hostile to democracy, within its framework. True democracy cannot be maintained if the chief concern of its citizens is the advantage of their own persons, or their class, regardless of the general interests of society or country. This danger is present, when finance predominates unduly, or when organized Labour pursues its policies independently of the realities of the country's position. Democracy does not necessarily mean fewer working hours and larger wages. It may even for a period involve longer hours and reduced pay. In any case, a democracy which measures its status and advantages in purely material terms and has little or no thought of what democracy means on a higher plane, is perilously near to disruption.

Democracy requires a serious education in the democratic spirit. As a social and political system, it safeguards individual rights and liberties ; it provides an impartial rule of law ; it administers impartial justice. It is established, in the last resort, upon a philosophy which is part of the Christian philosophy. It recognizes the value of the human person, with his individual life, a life which ultimately—though the professed democrat may not be so explicit—is directed towards God ; a life which can be fully lived and realized only in accord with the obligations of the moral law, and is intended to culminate in an after-life with God in Heaven. It insists upon certain fundamental and inalienable rights which are invested in the person and which other individuals, and human societies, must respect. It calls for liberties for those smaller groupings in which human activity deploys itself—the family in the first place, the free association,

the larger union. It supports, or should support, the widest measure of individual freedom that is consistent with the liberties of other individuals, and with the general health and protection of society.

It may be said that a true democracy recognizes a society of persons, whereas a prostitute democracy acknowledges merely a society of units or animated "things." This is the test. A totalitarian State cannot be democratic, by its very definition, even if its government should have been voted into power by a majority. Neither can a police State be democratic. Whether a completely organized Socialist State could be properly democratic, is another question. An appreciation of the responsibilities of democracy as well as of the philosophic basis of democracy is vitally important if democrats are to be able, intelligently and actively, to maintain democracy.

A Further Problem

ONE can trace back this notion of inevitable progress to various schools of nineteenth century thought, schools as diverse as those of the German philosopher, Hegel, the revolutionary Marx, and the scientific evolutionists like Darwin. Common to all these was the belief that the explanation of everything had to be sought in some continuous process of development or evolution. Things were explained, not by what they were, but as part of this cosmic process in which they were elements or aspects. This manner of accounting for things, not by reference to some higher reality, such as God, but merely as items within some constantly changing process, has very seriously affected the modern mind.

The consequences have been harmful. In the first place, evolution means that everything is *relative* to some particular stage in the process of evolution. If men's standards and institutions are conditioned by this process—as most evolutionists insist they are—then nothing absolute is left. There is no such thing as absolute truth, which is the same thing as saying there is no truth at all. If truth, of its essence, is relative, if the norms and values of human life alter from one era to the next, and are equally true in both, then it follows that they are in reality true in neither. For what is your test to decide which of the two standards of supposed truth is the more true? In any case, your evolutionist will not permit this question: in his eyes both systems of value are of equal importance, and neither has any permanent validity.

The influence of this manner of thinking upon modern ethics and sociology is evident. Morality is explained as the result of social conditions. Ethics are in effect abandoned, and sociology takes their place. Right and wrong have lost their original meaning; they are interpreted as what is beneficial, and what is harmful, to society as at present constituted. And the new "moralities" of Nazism and Bolshevism have taken this relativism one stage further, and made right and wrong merely what chanced to suit their particular theories

and policies. The democratic peoples have been horrified—and rightly so—by the effects of this latest relativism. But they would do well to remember that they themselves, through their acceptance of relativism, have prepared the way for such horrible effects. Unless there be accepted absolute principles of right and wrong, unless there are laws untouched by the passage of generations, and binding upon the human mind and conscience with a validity that is absolute, then it is difficult firmly to challenge and defeat this latest and foulest of relativities. In other words, the proper defence of democracy can be found only in the full acceptance of a moral code, absolute in character, and in the honest recognition of its implications. A time-serving attitude, which thinks only in terms of material convenience, is no adequate shield for democracy.

Another Consequence

THERE is one further consequence of this belief in evolution and progress which requires to be noted. In this way of looking at things, the individual man tends to lose his significance, while movements and processes are accepted as all-important. Individuals lose their outlines and are swallowed up in a group or class or party. They no longer think on their own; they are not permitted to do so, but must accept at once and blindly what is laid down for them by the rulers or leaders of group or class or party. The person tends to be absorbed by, to be engulfed in, the collective *mass*. The extreme form of this absorption of the individual is Soviet Communism. There, man is nothing; the movement is everything. In Soviet eyes the individual has no significance save as a pawn in the Soviet game, one item among innumerable other items in a gigantic machinery of revolution.

Modern means of mass persuasion, such as the popular press and the radio, have put into the hands of governments, and organized pressure-groups, a vast possibility of collective influence. The radio has been a great boon to mankind, but unfortunately it has also been employed to spread falsehood and to foster hatred and misunderstanding. It has been used to exercise a frightening psychological pressure on the minds of men. Minds have been deliberately warped and twisted for the purposes of political parties and regimes.

One of the most difficult problems of this century is that of the *mass mind*. Frequently, men have been so indoctrinated that they can no more think for themselves, or test the truth or even the probability of their indoctrination. All critical judgment has disappeared and all power of detachment from rumour or report. And when one remembers that to-day all political movements, to be successful, must be mass movements, one realises what a terrible power for persuasion and for evil is now in the hands of men. Here, too, it is incumbent upon the citizens of a democracy to retain their individuality; to keep a power of thought and judgment; to check this modern tendency to

mass appeal. The defence of a democratic way of life must be an intelligent defence, a defence of liberties and institutions because they are appreciated for their true purpose and value. A genuine education in democracy is extremely necessary in these days of widespread and irrational *mass propaganda*.

And Finally

THERE is one last tendency in this century which has also, I think, derived some impetus from an acceptance of the general ideas of evolution and progress. This stress upon the process or, in terms of political theory, the community, has encouraged men to think of the State as competent to provide the solution of all difficulties. It is granted, even by men who insist upon the rights of the individual citizen and of smaller social groups, that the State—that is, the Government claiming to act on behalf of the community—must to-day exercise greater supervision and control than would have been necessary or advisable in more simple ages. But the advocates of State control go further than this. They consider State interference not merely as a necessity ; they regard it as a good thing in itself : control for control's sake. This has made it easy for local Communist parties, in East Central European countries (the latest instance is Czechoslovakia) to seize the machinery of State and subject those peoples to a detested totalitarian rule. No one can fail to recognize that this advocacy of the Absolute State is a deadly threat to Christian principles, to the rights and liberties of the human person.

I am not suggesting that the limited programme of State control, advocated by the Labour Government in Britain constitutes such a threat. But all State programmes run the risk of sapping the energy and enterprise of individuals, and of making citizens look to public authorities rather than to themselves. The ancient Roman Empire died of State benevolence, of the "bread and Circuses," so thoughtfully provided by State officials. State provision can be necessary, but it is well to remember that countries can die from an overdose of it.

Czechoslovakia

NINE and ten years ago the name of Czechoslovakia was like the sounding of a funeral bell. The first Nazi campaign against that country ended, for the time being, in the Munich agreement ; the second, six months afterwards, made it certain that any further Nazi move of aggression would involve war.

This year has witnessed a Soviet onslaught upon Czechoslovakia, managed by a similar combination of pressure from outside and the machinations of a political party within. Is the funeral bell once more tolling ? Field-Marshal Smuts did not hesitate to say he had caught the sound of it, and that this must be the last Soviet move ; that otherwise . . . 1948 might bring the experiences of 1939.

The consequences of this Soviet manoeuvre in Czechoslovakia are

certain to be permanent, and most serious. It marks the final and irrevocable break between the Western Powers and Russia. The "open doors" we have been leaving, which have brought us little but an icy draught, are now for all practical purposes slammed to. The alliances between Britain and France on the one side, and Russia on the other, are relegated to the large salvage dumps of the Foreign Offices. The pretence of Four Power co-operation has worn so thin that no international "make-do-and-mend" can patch it up.

In the House of Lords, Lord Pakenham spoke of the Soviet move as "Communist in name, and Hitlerite in technique." The Bolsheviks have little to learn from the Nazis, but the Nazis, in their day, learned a great deal that was evil from the Bolsheviks. The Soviet move was Hitlerite *in reverse*, and here lies its chief political significance in Europe.

The Nazi occupation of Austria in 1938 outflanked Czechoslovakia, the military position of which would otherwise have been strong. The present Soviet seizure of Czechoslovakia outflanks Austria, and provides the Russians with a better opportunity for putting pressure upon that country. Czechoslovakia is a citadel in the heart of Europe. After Munich, and still more after the spring of 1939, it may have been a weapon directed against Russia. The Russian domination of Czechoslovakia now turns it into a weapon pointed towards the West. Nor should one forget, first that Czechoslovakia is a highly developed industrial country, and second that the Germans developed the Czech industries during the war to a remarkable degree. The industrial potential of Soviet Russia has been greatly increased by the recent moves in Czechoslovakia.

Who still needs the Lesson ?

THE Communist seizure of power in Czechoslovakia is the latest lesson—if there be any one in Western countries still needing to be taught it—that co-operation between other political parties and Communists is impossible. The Communist parties in other countries are not political parties in the accepted sense; they are groups of enemy agents who have succeeded in securing the support of some of the citizens on various false pretexts. The leaders and officials of those parties pursue the objectives, and carry out the instructions, which have been given to them by their Moscow chiefs. It is nonsense to speak, as some English papers have spoken, of the anti-Communist measures taken by the United States, as "witch hunting." The United States Government is, in any event, a better judge of what measures are suitable within its own democratic system than any foreign commentator. But as it becomes increasingly evident what Communist parties exist for, and where lies the allegiance of its members, the question must present itself: Would it not be better for other democratic countries to do some of this "witch hunting," while

there is yet time? British Communists may not be an important political group; but Trades Union leaders know to what extent individual Communists have infiltrated into important positions within the Trades Unions, and what potential weapons they have prepared, for times of industrial unrest and sabotage, on behalf of the Communist Party and the foreign masters who control it. The question remains: Would it not be better frankly to recognize this party for what it is, and get rid of it?

Whether its toleration be regarded as a lesser evil, or not, it is clear that the Labour Party has a grave responsibility to enlighten its members, and the electorate, on the true character and the real aims of the Communist party. If it is to safeguard its own position, and shoulder its responsibility to the British people, it must promote a campaign of political education on this most vital point. It has the obligation, also, of seeing that its own representatives are not, in certain cases, half or three-quarter Communists. There are a handful of members of Parliament, elected by the Labour vote, who belong to this category. It is perfectly well known who these men are. A slight acquaintance with the debates reported in *Hansard* would reveal their names and constituencies. The Labour Party will be stronger and more trusted if it jettisons these "fellow travellers." It will be spared, too, the unpleasantness of their company, and the awkward reactions, in foreign countries, to their curious speeches.

Events in Czechoslovakia are following the familiar plan: all political parties other than Communists and Socialists are to be disbanded. Action committees are to scour and scarify the country. Doubtless, they will discover a Czech Dr. Petkov and a Slovak Dr. Maniu. So-called People's Courts will be guilty of judicial murder. Universities and schools are to be indoctrinated and made "political." Another police State is created in the heart of Europe.

Quo Usque Tandem ?

THE efforts of the Soviet Government to gain control of Finland by a demand that Finland shall conclude a military alliance with Russia, on the lines of those already in existence between Russia and the Balkan countries, has raised yet further questions. Where is this policy of aggression to be halted? Every step along that pathway brings war nearer. Only those who remain wilfully blind can avoid this judgment or ignore its warning.

Soviet Russia has committed itself to an aggressive policy: how far does it intend or hope to push it? Is its purpose to seize all it can before the reorganization of Western Europe is made effective; before the recovery of Western Europe, in association with the United States, begins to exert its influence upon the other European lands now controlled by Russia? Will it, then, be content to remain in possession and control, as long as it can, of those Eastern European

countries, cutting off this large bloc of countries from the influence of the West? If her success is to be judged by military occupation and political control, then Soviet Russia has made gains during the past four years which are almost without parallel in history. Or does Russia now intend to challenge the world? Does it now deem that the time is ripe for the final effort to overcome the democratic nations? It is necessary for the democratic countries to bear both these alternatives in mind, and to be prepared to meet even the second of them.

There are pointers which cannot be ignored. From both Italy and France comes evidence that Communists are organizing action groups and committees as these were organized in Czechoslovakia: the intention being to create disorder and revolution. Signor de Gasperi has made this clear, as regards Italy, in his recent addresses, and similar activity is known to exist in France.

The pressure exerted upon the Finns to conclude a military pact with Russia is again patent of this double interpretation. Historically, there have been three lines of Russian penetration Westwards. The first, along the shores of the Baltic, with the purpose of dominating the Baltic Sea. Here, historically, Russia was checked first by Sweden, and then, very effectively, by Prussia. The second lay through Poland. The third, in the direction of the Straits and Constantinople, and of the mouths of the river Danube. If one examines to-day's position, the Russians have followed their second line of penetration far more than has even been practicable in the past. They have advanced right through Poland and Hungary; they occupy eastern Germany and central Czechoslovakia; they have outflanked Austria. The third objective, vigorously pursued, has been only partially realized. They have secured control of the mouths of the Danube, and dominate the Balkan peninsula, with the important exception of Greece. Greece and Turkey stand between them and their plan to control Constantinople and the entire Balkan peninsula, and thus to enter, and maybe dominate, the Eastern Mediterranean. But here the policy of the Western Powers has stiffened: American aid to Greece and Turkey, and the declared American policy, have made it evident that any further Soviet advance in this area means war.

There remains the first line of penetration—along the shores of the Baltic. Is it not likely that the military pact offered to Finland is intended to pave the way for advance along this line; and that Finland is meant as a springboard from which to put such stern pressure on Sweden and Norway, that the Russians may, from both a military and political viewpoint, control Scandinavia, and thus half encircle Western Europe?

Such questions inevitably present themselves. The combination of deceit and force in Russian policy compels us to bear them in mind. For firmness is the only practical reply to such a policy, if Europe and the whole world are to be saved.

CATHOLIC TOLERATION IN MARYLAND (1649)

WE read recently the following words : " Religious tolerance was the product of physical exhaustion, not of Christian teaching, but it was by fundamentally Christian arguments that it was transformed from a political expedient into an absolute value." This is the modern verdict upon toleration, pronounced by a leader-writer in the *Times Literary Supplement* : a verdict open to a certain questioning, which will be here attempted by a consideration of the Act of Toleration passed by the assembly of the colonists in Maryland on April 25th, 1649. This assembly was composed of the lieutenant-governor, William Stone, a Protestant, who acted for the proprietor and feudal lord of the colony, Cecil Lord Baltimore ; the council, which was composed of two Catholics and two Protestants ; and nine burgesses, of whom six (Cuthbert Fenwick, William Bretton, George Manners, John Maunsell, Thomas Thornborough and Walter Peake) were Catholics. Cecil Lord Baltimore was himself a Catholic and was married to Anne Arundell of Wardour. His younger brothers had been sent to St. Omers for their education, but he himself, being already a young man at the time when his father and the whole family became Catholics in 1624-5, had only such instruction in the faith as would have been given to him at that time. That a declaration of the principle of religious toleration should have been passed into law by an assembly where the majority was Catholic ; and that this Act should be the first in order of time of all acts of toleration enacted in territories subject to the British Crown : these are remarkable facts. It is to be hoped that the third centenary of their occurrence will not pass unnoticed next year.

The first Lord Baltimore, George Calvert, had been taken up by Robert Cecil soon after his leaving Oxford ; he had risen to be Secretary of State, in 1619, through his own efficiency and the patronage of Buckingham. The Spanish marriage negotiations, in which he was heavily involved, falling through, and Charles I being betrothed to Henrietta Maria, he resigned his office, declared himself a Catholic and retired to his estates in Co. Longford. But a grateful monarch allowed him to retain his membership of the Privy Council, and he came sometimes to London where he engaged in the business, dear to his heart, of promoting colonies, first in Newfoundland and then in Maryland. He took the side of the Jesuits in the dispute with the Bishop of Chaldeon over faculties, and seems to have been an intimate friend of the Provincial, Father Richard Blount. As soon as his " pious zeale to enlarge the extent of the Christian world " had led to the maturing of plans for a colony on the unoccupied coast between Virginia and New

England, and more precisely on the tongue of land between Chesapeake Bay and the Potomac (a peninsula at the base of which now stand the cities of Washington and Baltimore), he besought Fr. Blount to supply him with missionaries. To allay the popular disquiet that might have been expected to attend the departure from England of some two hundred recusants, attended by Jesuit chaplains, a small tract was put about which argued that this departure was not against the public interest :

The Protestants in Virginia and New England are like to increase much faster by new supplies of people yearely from England etc., then are the Roman Catholiques in Mariland. Moreover, although they should (which God forbid and which the English Protestants in those parts will in all probability be still able to prevent) shake off any dependance on the Crowne of England, yet first England would by this meanes be freed of so many suspected persons now in it ; secondly it would loose little by it ; and lastly, even in that case, it were notwithstanding more for the honour of the English nation that English men, although Roman Catholiques, and although not dependant on the Crowne of England, should possess that country than forraigners, who otherwise are like to do it : for the Swedes and the Dutch have two severall Plantations already in New England, and upon the confines of Mariland . . . and doe incroach every day more and more.

The matter of religious toleration was put bluntly in the second objection and answered by reasonings which have the stamp of the Catholic apologist upon them :

Such a licence will seem to be a kind of tolleration of (at least a connivence at) Popery which some may find a scruple of Conscience to allow of in any part of the Kings Dominions, because they esteeme it a kinde of idolatry. . . .

ANSWER. Such scrupulous persons may as well have a scruple to let the Roman Catholiques live here, although it be under persecution, as to give way to such a licence, because banishment from a pleasant, plentifull and ones owne native country, into a wilderness among salvages and wild beasts, although it proceed (in a manner) from ones own election, yet in this case, where it is provoked by other ways of persecution, is but an exchange rather than a freedome of punishment, and perhaps in some mens opinions from one persecution to a worse. For divers malefactors in this Kingdome have chosen rather to be hanged than to goe into Virginia.

The pamphleteer goes on to argue that the Indians are undoubted idolators, and yet they are tolerated in British Dominions ; and that Catholic foreign ambassadors in London are also tolerated and allowed to have Popish chapels. The last point was quite judiciously put, for just at this time, since the arrival of the King's French wife in June, 1625, the embassy chapels had been much frequented, and the Queen's Capuchins (who soon replaced Bérulle's Oratorians) were an object of much curiosity at Somerset House. There had been times when

the attaches of the French embassy had drawn swords to drive off the pursuivants who were found waiting outside the embassy chapel at the end of Sunday Mass. None the less, it is clear from the pamphlet that the purpose of the colony was to secure some religious liberty for Catholics. What is not clear, whether in the pamphlet or in the wording of the Charter granted by the King on June 20th, 1632, is that there was to be toleration, in the new colony, as between Catholics and Protestants. No precedent could be claimed for this: for the well-known Mayflower pilgrims, while securing freedom of worship for themselves, intended to give it to no one else who should come into their colony; and indeed the few stray Catholics in New England had a hard time of it. There were, it is true, some ideas of toleration put forward by Fr. Robert Persons in his *Treatise tending to Mitigation*, which in view of the rarity of the book, may with advantage be set down here:

If it be so that subjects of different religions are not comfortable together, under a Prince that is of one of those religions (for so must the question be proposed if we will handle it in general) then how doe Jewes and Christians live together under many Christian Princes in Germany and Italy? under the state of Venice? Yea under the Pope himselfe? Hoe doe Christians and Turkes live together under the Turkish emperour of Constantinople, as also under the Persian, without persecution for their religion? How did Catholiques and Arrians live so many yeares together under Arrian kinges and emperours in old time, both in Spaine and elsewhere? How doe Catholiques and Protestants live together at this day under the most Christian King of France? under the great king of Polonia? and under the German Emperour in divers parts of his dominions (all Catholique princes) and in the free cities of the Empire? And in particular is it to be considered that the Hussites have lived now some hundreds of yeares in Bohemia under the Catholique princes and emperours, lordes of that country, with such freedome of conversation with Catholique subjects, and union of obedience to the said princes, as at this day in the great City of Praga (where the Emperour commonly resideth and where Catholiques doe wholly govern) there is not so much as one parish church known to be in the hands of any Catholique pastor of that city, but all are Hussites that have the ordinary charges of soules; and Catholiques, for service, sermons and sacraments, doe repaire only to monasteries, according to auncient agreements and conventions betweene them, though in number the said Catholiques be many times more than the other, and have all the government and commandry in their hands, as hath been said. These are demonstrative proofs *ad hominem*, and cannot be denied, and consequently doe convince that this make-bate minister's proposition is false in general: That subjects of different religions may not live together in civill peace, if their governours will permit them.

One may allow Fr. Persons to pursue his quiet and sober reckoning with Thomas Morton, while noting that Richard Blount, the friend of George Calvert who obtained the charter for Maryland, had been for

eleven years a Jesuit when Fr. Persons wrote his *Treatise tending to Mitigation*. Indeed he had been one of those priests whom Fr. Persons managed to introduce into England in 1592 in the guise of English sailormen who were being repatriated by the Spaniards from a supposed captivity. He was a man of great prudence and moderation, and Abbott, the Archbishop of Canterbury is said to have refrained from having Fr. Blount's hiding-place in London searched, on account of their old friendship at Oxford. He would not be the man to desire that, in a colony where Catholics predominated, there should be no liberty for Protestants. The wording of the Charter is restrained on the matter of religion: "Also We do grant license of erecting and founding churches, chapels and places of worship, in suitable and convenient places, within the premises, and of causing the same to be dedicated and consecrated according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England." The dedication of a Protestant church would be somewhat difficult, seeing that the only ministers of religion who sailed with the original expedition to Maryland were the two Jesuits, Fr. Andrew White and Fr. John Grosvenor or Altham.

The name of the first settlement which George Calvert had sponsored was Avalon, and this venture in Newfoundland had been, even though begun before his conversion to Catholicism, somewhat of an attempt to spread Christianity in the new world after the legendary example of Joseph of Arimathea in Glastonbury. The venture had not been a success, and many of the settlers had come back to England before the expedition to Maryland set out. The ship which carried the expedition to Maryland was named the *Ark of Avalon*, and its pinnacle the *Dove*. When one sees the names of the gentlemen who sailed with the expedition, the symbolism of the Ark becomes clear. A son of Sir Thomas Gerard, a son of Sir Thomas Wiseman, two sons of Lady Ann Wintour, all these take part in the expedition, while among the financially interested one finds the name of Mrs. Wells. Cecil, the second Lord Baltimore, did not go with the expedition his father had planned, but remained in England to supervise the infant colony from England; while his younger brother, Leonard Calvert, was the first governor, acting in this role until his death in 1647. All these Catholics concerned with the enterprise afford a proof that it was indeed a way of escape for Catholics from a sinful and persecuting world, a veritable ark of salvation. Years before, Fr. Persons had been asked his opinion upon such colonial enterprises, and like a prudent general had seen that the mere prospect of such an escape would so divide the Catholic forces in England that those who remained would be all the more closely beset with persecution for the smallness of their numbers:

The entrance of Priests and comminge of scholars to the Seminaries would be more narrowly looked unto . . . priests also could not find sufficient harbour in England; and other such like things would probably follow.

There was for Catholics another aspect of the enterprise, that of carrying the faith to the heathen. Fr. Persons had written, at the end of his judgment, that : " The intention of convertinge those people liketh me soe well and in soe high a degree as for that onely I would desire myself to goe in the jorney, shutting my eyes to all other difficulties." Similarly, in the *Declaratio Coloniae*, prepared by Fr. Andrew White and published by Baltimore in 1633, one may read : " To convey into the said land and neighbouring parts the light of the gospel and of the truth, where it is certain no knowledge of the true God has ever shed its beams," is stated to be the principal object of the expedition. In the minds of some at least of the colonists the thought of their own religious freedom was uppermost. Later, in 1638, the captain of the colonial militia, a Catholic named Cornwallis, wrote to Baltimore : " Your Lordship knows my security of contiens was the first condition that I expected from this government ; which then you thought soe inocent as you conceived the proposition altogether impertinent." In other words, some of the settlers were so anxious about their freedom of conscience that they urged Baltimore to give them some guarantee in writing before they left England that it would be respected, but he had assured them that this right would be so obviously safe as not to need formulation. He was indeed as nervous about the success of his enterprise as a girl over her first ball. He drew up a detailed instruction for his brother Leonard about the conduct of the party on board ship. There was to be no singing of High Mass with full orchestra, lest the Protestant sailors take alarm and ruin the whole affair at the start :

His Lordship requires . . . they be very carefull to preserve unity and peace amongst all the passengers on shipp-board, and that they suffer no scandall nor offence to be given to any of the Protestants, whereby any just complaint may heereafter be made by them in Virginea or England ; and that for that end they cause all acts of Romane Catholique religion to be done as privately as may be, and that they instruct all the Romane Catholiques to be silent upon all occasions of discourse concerning matters of religion ; and that the said governor and commissioners treat the Protestants with as much mildness and favour as justice will permit. And this to be observed at land as well as at sea.

Naturally a dispute about religion, if it had broken out among the settlers, might have led to one section of them remaining at Barbadoes, or at some other port of call on the way, and thus have wrecked the whole enterprise.

The first few years of the colony went well ; chapels were built, the natives were approached by the priests and some conversions were made. But this very success was the cause of difficulties. The natives desired that one of the priests should live amongst them, and to this end they promised to give up some land which could be used to support a priest. (There was no money in use in the colony as yet,

but all commerce was by barter.) Now the proprietor, Lord Baltimore, claimed that all exchange of lands was subject to his control, and was anxious that no perpetual title to land should be established such as would be that of a religious corporation in the case of land given them by the natives. He had recently sent out to the colony, as his agent and secretary to the governor, a convert clergyman, John Lewger, who had sacrificed a living worth £400 a year and who had been dependent on the charity of Catholics in London since his conversion. This man, arriving in November, 1637, proceeded to put to rights, as he thought, the legal position of affairs in the colony. He produced a ready-made code of laws which he had brought with him from Lord Baltimore in England. But at a meeting of the Assembly, in the spring of 1638, the stubborn Englishmen who formed the backbone of that body voted it down, and set up a commission of five, Cornwallis, Wintour, Governor Calvert, and two others named Evelyn and Snow, to draft a new code. This committee, after much deliberation, put it to the Assembly that they should proceed to vote on each law separately. At this point a delay in the discussion was inevitable, while the new Secretary should consult his master in London and receive fresh instructions. Some of his proposed laws had claimed to regulate such matters as the grant of land by natives to colonists, the validity of an inheritance by the daughter of a colonist if she remained unmarried after the age of 25, and the freedom of the colonists to leave the colony and travel among the natives.

In the 34th law, among the enormous crimes, one is "exercising jurisdiction and authoritye, without lawfull power and commission derived from the Lord Proprietarie. Hereby even by Catholiques a law is provided to hange any Catholique bishop that should cumme hither, and also every priest, if the exercise of his functions be interpreted jurisdiction and authoritye." Such was the protest which one of the missionaries, Fr. Thomas Copley, addressed to Baltimore. The colonists left no doubt about their Catholic sentiments, for in the next session they enacted that: "Holy Church within this province shall have all her rights, liberties and immunities safe, whole and inviolable in all things. This Act to continue till the end of the next General Assembly, and then, with the consent of the Lord Proprietarie, to be perpetuall." In 1640 this law was re-enacted by the Assembly and became perpetual. The matter of an oath of loyalty to the King, which had much exercised Baltimore, as it was exercising Charles himself and the Papal envoy, George Con, in London during the years 1636-1639, was settled by the Assembly, which adopted a formula expressing a willingness to defend the King against all treasons and conspiracies, without a mention of the much-controverted deposing power.

Baltimore tried to get the Jesuit Provincial in England to sign various agreements which would bind the hands of his subjects in the

colony, but the new Provincial, Fr. Knott, would not be entangled in them. Baltimore then turned to the secular clergy in London and sought for men amongst them to go on the mission in place of the Jesuits. Two of them actually reached Maryland, where they immediately saw for themselves how things stood and adopted the same stand as the Jesuits in the matter of the rights of the Church, after which they soon came back to England.

The feverish negotiations with the Papal representative in London, Mgr. Carlo Rossetti, and with Propaganda, were going on while the Parliamentary mob was shouting for the blood of Rossetti in the streets of the city. The poor distracted Italian diplomat must have agreed with Panzani's earlier comment on Baltimore's negotiations about the oath: "*Questo é un negotio molto aromatico.*" Meanwhile the tireless Secretary Lewger had sent over *Twenty Questions* or cases of conscience for decision on matters that arose between Church and state in the colony, and solutions must be sought. Since the suppression of the Canon Law by Henry VIII there had not been an occasion when, on English soil, the Church had had liberty to assert any of her rights before this. The problem was to find ways and means of adapting those rights to a situation where the medieval relationship of Church to State no longer subsisted, but where new and bold experiments might succeed. It will thus be seen that the case of Maryland was of much greater consequence than might be judged from the numbers of colonists, or the comparatively slight importance of their claims. Among Lewger's questions was the following:

Whether may Catholiques, being members in a Generall Assembly in such a country as this, consent to any lawes touching causes matrimonial . . . or for contracts of spousall, divorce, etc. Whether in such a country as this, may a Catholique Commissary refuse to prove and record a will for this reason, because it giveth Legacies for masses to be said for the soule of the deceased.

The Bishop of Chalcedon, Richard Smith, had come to grief because he had acted in England as if he were a diocesan bishop of the age before the Reformation. He had expected the laity to accept his claim to prove wills, and to use such other mixed powers as had been customary in times past, but they resented this claim and agitated for his recall. Now a situation arose in Maryland where the penalties of high treason for the setting up of a foreign jurisdiction did not certainly apply, and the case was altered. Lewger, as the Jesuit Provincial said in his statement to the Holy Office, was for allowing only those rights and privileges to the Church which could be proved *from Scripture*: thus betraying that he still retained a very Protestant mentality.

The dispute between Baltimore and the Jesuits came to a sudden end by the irruption of Parliamentary sympathizers into Maryland in 1645. They carried off Fr. Andrew White and Fr. Thomas Copley and sent them back to England, where they successfully withstood the

attempts of Parliamentary lawyers to have them convicted as priests. As Copley pointed out, it was not an offence to be a priest, but to come to England as a priest, and he had not done that of his own accord. He was accordingly able to make his way back to Maryland, where he arrived in 1648, in time to witness the momentous Act of Toleration in the following year. The Assembly, in that year, proceeded to enact that no abusive names were to be used amongst the colonists in matters relating to religion; among the examples given are: "Idolater, popish priest, Jesuit, Roundhead, Anabaptist, separatist." There seems to have been more feeling in those days for names used in reproach; one has but to recall the warmth of indignation shown by Dogberry in *Much Ado* about his being called an ass. The wording of the Act of Toleration is as follows:

Whereas the enforcing of conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it has been practised, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this province, and the better to preserve mutual love and unity amongst the inhabitants, no person or persons whatsoever within this province or the islands, ports, harbours, creeks or havens thereunto belonging, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth be any ways troubled, or molested, or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof within this province or the islands thereunto belonging, nor any way compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion, against his or her consent.

The historian of the Maryland mission, Fr. Thomas Hughes, S.J., is disposed in his four volumes on *The Society of Jesus in North America* (1907-1917) to make light of this act, and to regard it as the last dying sigh of the spirit of toleration rather than a brave beginning. It is true that the observance of the Act was fraught with difficulties when Puritans began to infiltrate into the colony from the North, and when the echoes of the civil strife in England were heard in Maryland. But one must remember that in 1658, when the administration of Maryland was upset by the interference of partisans of Cromwell from England, Fr. Darby was able to protect himself by an appeal to this Act when put on trial for his priesthood, and even in the dark days of the 18th century when the Baltimores had gone, the prosecution of a Jesuit was always a chancy matter for the Crown lawyers, who could not be sure what view would be taken of the efficacy of English penal laws in the colony, even of those passed in the time of William III.

That the credit of the Act should go to the Catholics of Maryland is beyond doubt, since they were clearly in a majority at its passing. From an episode in the following year, 1650, it is equally clear that the missionaries had some share in that credit, for when in 1650 it was proposed that an oath should bind all members to secrecy about the matter of their deliberations, the member for St. Inigoes Hundred (where the mission was), a Catholic named Matthews, refused to take

the oath because he would be debarred by it from consulting his confessor on any doubt of conscience he might have. He was expelled, but the subsequent election returned to the Assembly the other layman who acted as agent for the Mission, Mr. Fenwick, and on his refusal of the oath as it lay, without an excepting clause for the rights of conscience, the whole house declared that it was never intended to bar a man from forming his conscience by whatever means he might choose, and he then took the oath to the satisfaction of all. Now this episode shows that consultation between the members of the Assembly who were Catholics and the missionaries on matters of religion would not be unusual, and it is hardly likely that on the matter of toleration such consultation had not taken place. One might even claim that the wording of the Act, in the part where it speaks of mutual love and unity, was an echo of the Rules of the Society of Jesus. Be that as it may, one must agree with Cardinal Manning when, in the dispute with Gladstone over Vaticanism in 1874-5, he said (*The Vatican Decrees*, p. 91): "The modern spirit certainly had no share in producing the Constitution of Maryland. . . . It was founded by a Catholic upon the broad moral law . . . that to force men to profess what they do not believe is contrary to the law of God." Gladstone took the line at first that the Maryland Act was preceded by others in the West Indies, but he was shown to be wrong in his facts on this contention, and then he fell back, in reply to Manning, on the idea that: "The measure was really defensive; and its main and very legitimate purpose plainly was to secure the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion" (*Vaticanism*, p. 128). Defensive the Act may have been, in the time of its enactment; but that it embodied a practice which Catholics were willing to share with others, and had already for a dozen years shared with others, cannot be gainsaid. When John Locke came to draw up the Constitution of Carolina in 1669 he incorporated in it an article upon this matter of toleration: "No person whatsoever shall disturb, molest, or persecute another for his speculative opinions in religion or his way of worship (CIX). No person of any other church or profession shall disturb or molest any religious assembly (CII)." An article was later added, against Mr. Locke's judgment, providing for the public maintenance of Anglicanism; but he himself had required no more than a belief in one God of those who joined the colony. If one compares his sentiments with those of Milton, who in 1644 had put into his tract *Areopagitica*, on the freedom of the press, very intolerant ideas on Catholicism, one may judge that the example of Maryland had wrought a change in the minds of honest men. Milton, arguing that it is more prudent and more Christian that many be tolerated, rather than all compelled, added at once: "I mean not tolerated Popery and open superstition, which as it extirpates all religions and civil supremacies, should itself be extirpate, provided first that all charitable and compassionate means be used to

win and regain the weak " : a strange commentary on the fact that Popery had, at the time he wrote, been showing the way to toleration in Maryland.

The facts about Maryland and toleration are all the more in need of emphasis because the recent historian of opinions about toleration, Dr. W. K. Jordan, of Chicago, having in 1940 completed some four volumes on the *Development of Religious Toleration in England* during the century 1560-1660, devoted exactly one footnote on one page to the toleration experiment in Maryland. Historians have recognized that his hasty and unbalanced generalizations do not equal in value the material he has collected from a multitude of sources, but some better sense of proportion than this might have been expected. (Cf. *Eng. Hist. Rev.* : 1938, p. 166 and 1944, p. 275). In a rare tract with the promising title of *Hypocrisy Unmasked*, which appeared in 1776 in London as a reply to the propaganda of the American colonies, the case of Maryland is discussed and reasons assigned for the strange freedom of religion which Catholics enjoyed there : " The reason for this partiality of the Crown to the Roman Catholic religion is easily accounted for ; in the reigns of James I and his son Charles, the ministry attempted to make the colonies solely dependent upon the person of the King, and in those unsettled periods of our constitution the Commons were sometimes checked when they endeavoured to consider America as an appendage belonging to the kingdom. The Roman Catholics therefore being judged most devoted to the claims of monarchy, were treated with the greatest regard by the sovereign ; and as the laws would not allow them an equality with Protestants in England, it was judged politic to grant them a superiority in America. Besides, the more discordant the religions and constitutions of the several provinces were, the greater the probability appeared of their severally attaching themselves to their common head." Policy such as this there may have been in the grant of the charter, but it must also be remembered that the colony was called after Henrietta Maria (Charles was going to call it Mariana, when someone reminded him that a Jesuit of that name did not like kings), and that Charles was very devoted to his Catholic wife. She had failed in her purpose to win from him the reconciliation of the kingdom to Rome ; what more natural than that she should press upon him the idea of a refuge for Catholics in the New World ? When once the Catholics had found themselves in a majority there, they determined to show what their own faith would allow them to do in the matter of toleration. This they did by their conduct in the early days of the colony ; and only came to the enacting of it in a law when there seemed to be some danger that, owing to the civil war in England, their peaceable existence would not long continue. Their action was hardly that of men exhausted with religious warfare, but rather that of men who had at last found the opportunity for presenting to the world a parable of their faith.

The General of the Jesuits, Fr. Mutius Vitelleschi, wrote in 1643, to the English Provincial, that the growth of the Church in Maryland might console him for the losses he was suffering in Europe. The younger members of the Province, engaged on their studies at Liège, were extremely keen to join in the work in Maryland, and many of them wrote to the Provincial to speak of their desire to go there. One, Laurence Worsly, writes : "Noe crosse ever strook so deep into me as when I saw many able men restrained from doing such things as were very suitable to their vocation. [The time was 1640 when all work in England would be at a stand owing to the civil strife.] But now, seeing such a plentiful harvest prepared for them, sorrow must give place to joy." He suggests that his portion of the family estate in England might be realized at once : "Peradventure my step-mother, who is my Lord Montigue his aunt, will be able to effect it." Another student speaks of his inexperience of heretics, thus showing that they did not expect to deal with Indians all the time, but knew that the hopes of converting heretics from Virginia or New England were great : "Perchance I should find some difficulty in matter of controversy with heretiques there, having yett read but little in that kynde, and had no practice at all." Still, for the most part, it was the mission to the Indians which attracted these young Englishmen. Ever since 1604, when the English translation of Fr. Jose de Acosta's *Naturall and Morall Historie of the Indies* had appeared, young Catholics, and those converted to the faith in England, had been able to read of the strange wonders of Mexico and Peru, and even Maryland was looked upon as the Indies—perhaps because the ships sailed first to Barbadoes before making their way up the coast of the mainland. In Acosta they might read how : "In a certain great Bay in Florida (the which runnes 300 leagues within the land) they see whales in some season of the years, which come from the other sea. It was a thing agreeing with the wisdom of the Creator, and the goodly order of Nature, that as there was communication and a passage betwixt the two seas at the Pole Antartike, so in like sort there should be one at the Pole Artike, which is the principall Pole." Or again : "The chiefe use of this cacao is in a drinke which they call *Chocolaté*, whereof they make great accompt in that country, foolishly and without reason ; for it is loathsome to such as are not acquainted with it, having a skumme or froth that is very unpleasant to taste, if they be not very well conceited thereof." These and other sources of fear and wonder might harrow up their young blood, but the Society of Jesus was willing to go on losing men to the climate and the hazards of this experiment in religious freedom, knowing that in the time of God's Providence it would be blessed with a great reward. Of 17 men who went to the Maryland mission in the first 20 years (1634-1654) nine had died and four returned to England by 1654.

J. H. CREHAN

CONTROVERSY IN THE CATHEDRAL

THE MIND AND MOTIVES OF ST. THOMAS BECKET

THE appearance of Dr. Foreville's "*L'Église et La Royauté en Angleterre sous Henri II Plantagenet*," with its vast erudition and patent hero-worship, brings to the fore once more, the disputed question of the issue between the King and the Archbishop. It is a topic on which there has always been discussion. Diversity of opinion was natural enough in Becket's day. The practical need of making a choice between the King and "that great traitor, my enemy," and the desire for self-justification once that choice was made, inevitably produced contradictory convictions: both about the character and motives of Becket, and the importance of the points in dispute. And in any case, at that period in the development of Canon Law, the canonical aspects of the case were by no means so clear-cut as to exclude some variety of interpretation. But why is it that, ever since, so few writers have succeeded in resisting the lure of partizanship, and in keeping their analyses above the level of sectarian controversy? It is not that there is any lack of material available; in the Rolls Series alone there are some 4,700 pages of lives and letters which bear upon the subject.

In a sense, Becket himself is partly to blame. He is an extremely complex character, and so forceful that it is difficult to remain neutral: people tend either to admire or to detest him. The issue itself is largely a constitutional and canonical one, which admits of objective treatment in so far as it involves a question of fact, of establishing what in reality was at stake. But once we try to put the issue in its wider context and to make a judgment on Becket's conduct, the personal element becomes involved and our opinion is almost necessarily influenced by what we think of the Archbishop's character and motives. If, for instance, we agree with Mlle Foreville that all he said and did was right, then we shall almost inevitably view the issue in quite another way than does Dr. Brooke, who was convinced that Becket "was so self-centred that he would often sacrifice the prospect of an immediate advantage for the ephemeral satisfaction of a verbal victory. As Archbishop, except perhaps at the very beginning and the very end, there is little in him of the spiritually-minded man."¹

But is it necessary to adopt either of these extreme standpoints? Indeed, is either correct? One thing is clear; before we can pass a judgment on Becket's conduct of the case we must attempt to find an answer to a further question: how exactly did he view the conflict? What did he think he was fighting for, and why did he resist so stubbornly when even the Bishops were against him and he had every

¹ Z. N. Brooke: *The English Church and the Papacy*, p. 211.

natural incentive to compromise or yield? Was it mere obstinacy as Foliot¹ thought; or pride as Roger of York asserted; or was it the self-centredness that Dr. Brooke saw in his character? These are questions of fact which admit of a fair degree of objective treatment. If the answer can be found anywhere it can be found in Becket's own letters and speeches, and in the reports of his friends and enemies; they should show what sort of a mind he had and what exactly he thought was at stake. I am not here concerned with passing judgment on the question whether his analysis was in fact, right or wrong; nor on the question whether he could have avoided the quarrel altogether if he had been less intense and more diplomatic; nor with the nature of the issue in itself, save in so far as it is necessary for an understanding of his outlook. All that this essay seeks to do is to put the conflict in its setting, to try to get inside the mind of the Archbishop and to see the issue as he saw it.

Though the struggle between Becket and the King became overlaid with side issues, and obscured by strong feeling, few contemporaries lost sight of the fact that the core of the matter was Becket's refusal to give formal assent to the Constitutions of Clarendon. These Constitutions were no more than the expression, in written form, of certain unwritten customs which had governed the relation of Church and State in England since the Conquest. William had made England into a feudal state, and had fitted the Church into that State in a manner which made the Ruler responsible for the welfare of both Church and State. Acting on lines of contemporary custom he thus exercised a certain measure of control over ecclesiastical affairs. From this conception of statecraft, taken for granted by Kings and Bishops alike, sprang certain practical "Customs," granted to the Conqueror by Pope Gregory VII and, more reluctantly, to Henry I for his lifetime: a degree of royal control over the election of Bishops and Abbots—over ecclesiastical persons and causes, and above all over the relations of the hierarchy with the Pope.

But by Becket's time, the sweep of history had brought about a change of relationship, at least in practice. The death of Henry I had been followed by the nineteen long years of civil war during which civil government was practically at a standstill; and the King had been forced to will away lands and privileges to win supporters. No body had profited more than the Church; the Government's need had been the Church's opportunity. Thanks to the wholesale concessions by which the support of the Church was secured in the civil struggle, the royal controls were swept away both in theory and in

¹ Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of Hereford 1148-63, and of London 1163-87, was the most outstanding member of the English hierarchy in 1161. Alexander III described him as "vir religiosus, litteratus, providus et discretus in omnibus" (*Materials*, VII, 274). He objected to Becket's election to Canterbury and later became the leader of the Bishops against the Archbishop: "incentor schismatis et totius malitiae artifex ab initio" (*Mat.* VII, 279). His view of the controversy is expressed fully and clearly, and with a biting pen, in his famous letter written in 1165 (*Mat.* V, 521-543).

practice; and the full Hildebrandine doctrine of Church independence had been nearly achieved. The "Customs" had died out; there had come in freedom of election, freedom for Church Courts, freedom of appeals to Rome; and what evidence there is suggests that the Pope was in closer contact with this country than with any other State in Europe.¹

Furthermore, this change in practice coincided with the spread into England of that growth in self-consciousness in the mind of the Church which had been going on since the pontificate of Leo IX a century before. This point will be returned to later. For the moment it is enough to note that when Henry II came to the throne, in 1154, not only had the Church grown accustomed to a new relation between Church and State in practice but, among a considerable body of Churchmen, the old system was thought to be no longer tenable as being in contradiction with the Canons.

Such, however, was not Henry's opinion. Young, vigorous, brilliant domineering, a man of terrifying strength of mind and body, inspired with a passion for justice and organization, he had been brought up in that other stream of thought which was manifesting itself in the attitude of the kings on the Continent: the claim of the lay power to superiority over the spiritual. Determined, like all his contemporaries, to accept what he regarded as his full inheritance and to bring efficiency back to the government, looking on Stephen as a usurper and therefore refusing to acknowledge the lawfulness of any of his acts, Henry was resolved to pick up the threads where his grandfather had let them fall. That involved, in practice, that he should ignore the developments of the past twenty years and reassert his claim to "the Customs of my Grandfather." Being confident that he would find in his Chancellor, Becket, a willing tool, the King forced the Primacy upon his friend as a prelude to his campaign of reorganization. Instead of a helper, he found in Becket a man as purposeful as himself, completely certain of what he held, fortified by a stubborn intransigence and burning conviction of the rightness of his cause. The rest of the story worked itself out with all the inevitability of a Greek drama: the refusal to accept the Constitutions, the campaign of lies and slander and violence, the diplomacy and futile conferences that came to an end only with the threat of an interdict, the patched-up peace of Fretéval, and the murder in the Cathedral.

Tall, handsome, forceful yet gentle, despite his slight stammer an eloquent speaker and brilliant in debate, Becket had two qualities that made him very difficult to argue with. He was a peculiar mixture of magnificence and rigidity. The splendid gesture simply flowed from him, and he had a way of ending arguments in a manner that left Henry speechless with rage, and made Foliot declare that he always

¹ Dr. Brooke's theory of the relation of England and Rome before 1172 is clearly untenable. Cf. M. Cheney, *The Compromise of Avranches and the Spread of Canon Law in England*, E.H.R. LVI (Ap. 1941), pp. 177-197.

had been a fool and always would be. When, for example, the Council of Northampton was summoned in order to condemn him he entered in full pontificals, carrying his own cross, dominated the Council with the power of his personality, forbade them to give judgment and then walked out, tripping up unfortunately on the doorstep as he went ! It was difficult to negotiate with such a man, especially when that sense of drama was so strangely mixed with rigidity of soul and a penetrating mind. Henry was not interested in abstract questions of right and wrong ; what he wanted was practical realities : to keep the debate on the field of history and of fact. The Archbishop brought a new quality to the debate ; his mind dug down instinctively through outward appearances to underlying principles. Once he had brought the problem to that level he was at his ease and ready to debate. Henry's demands might be reasonable ; the privileges might be customs. For Becket the right question to ask was : were they good customs, and what gave validity to a law ? And to him the answer was clear : the Customs were condemned by Canon Law, therefore the case was ended. " Christ is known to have said ' I am Truth ' ; He never said ' I am Custom ! ' " " *Legem legi divinae repugnantem, non admitto.*"

Throughout the conflict it was this analytical cast of mind that emerged from nearly all Thomas Becket's letters and speeches. It was a lawyer's mind—and naturally so, for he was an extremely competent Canonist. Educated in Civil and Canon Law at Auxerre and Bologna, probably under Gratian himself, certainly while Gratian was lecturing there, with wide practical experience of the Courts, he had been brought up in an intellectual world which was undergoing a revolution. The new culture of the Universities, with its questioning of fundamentals, its acrimony and dependence on subtle distinctions, was everywhere in evidence, and the keenness and rigidity of the legal mind had been reborn in the prolonged controversies that sprang from the bitter struggle between Empire and Papacy. This conflict had only come to an end when Becket was a youth, and it had left a legacy which Becket inherited : a renewed interest in that codification and study of the teaching of the Fathers and Popes and Councils on the nature of the Church and of Society. This had come to a head with the publication of Gratian's "*Decretum*" in 1140, and given rise to a complexus of new convictions on the nature and rights of the Church which were in complete opposition to the old ideas represented by the pre-Hildebrandine theory of Church and State and the "*Customs of my Grandfather.*"¹ In the ancient Canons the Church

¹ Gratian pervades Becket's letters and speeches ; there is a vivid account of his skill in debate and his readiness in the use of the *Decretum* in the description of his debate with the Cardinals at Sens in the *Thomas Saga I*, p. 303. It is particularly his realisation of the dignity of the priesthood and of the evils of State control, and his statements on the relations of Church and State which illustrate how completely he had absorbed the ideas of Gregory VII and his circle, and made them his own. His immense reverence for the authority of the papacy was in the same stream of tradition.

found historical and dogmatic proofs of the validity of this growing conviction about the dignity and *plena potestas* of the Pope, of his right to interfere unasked in the affairs of the Church in any State, and of the evils of lay control over elections or ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Further, the diffusion of the Canons aroused in many a new rigidity of soul, an over-riding sense of obligation, a belief that through the Canons God spoke to man and declared his plan for right world order. What was against the Canons, then, was intolerable because it was contrary to the Law of God. The obligation imposed by the Canons was absolute.

These new convictions, this new sense of obligation, Becket had made completely his own; and they guided his mind throughout his conflict with the King. How could he accept the Constitutions of Clarendon? He was convinced that they were contrary to the "*sacrosanctorum patrum constituta quaedam edita propter nos,*" and Alexander III, himself a leading Canonist, had confirmed his verdict. To accept them would be a form of apostasy, the joining of a species of private schism. In any case, Henry's historical argument was not above criticism; for not only did it deny the progress of the past twenty years, but the King's demand for *formal approval* of the Customs was at any rate an innovation. As Becket pointed out more than once, none of his predecessors in the see of Canterbury had been asked for this, save Anselm; and he had gone into exile rather than agree. If former archbishops had tolerated the Customs it was because they could not abolish them; and, as Herbert of Bosham later told the King, formal approval would remove all hope of emendation. Many of the things their Fathers had done and tolerated could be excused by ignorance; he, Becket, could plead no such excuse.

Henry might appeal to sweet reasonableness; but in Becket's eyes his demand was not reasonable. As he said, there is at times a higher wisdom than efficiency, and you have to draw the line somewhere. Foliot might argue from expediency; Becket based his case on principle. The Bishops might be influenced by that most powerful of arguments, "Like as to the roaring of the lion, so is the voice of the King"; but Becket allayed his private fears by obedience and by trust in God. For him the argument resolved itself into a set of choices: he must make his choice between allegiance to the law of the land and obedience to the Law of God; between allegiance to his temporal Lord in London and loyalty to his spiritual Lord in Rome; between the theory that coronation was a sacrament which touched the King with priestly power and gave him a right to interfere in the affairs of the Church, and the burning conviction which he had absorbed from the Church Reformers that the King was a mere layman whose duty was to serve and not to rule in the spiritual sphere. There could be only one answer: "Must we not obey God rather than man? Must we not obey Christ's Vicar rather than an earthly King?"

"Absit ut scienter faciam contra Deum pro quiete momentanea et non tam perituris quam pereuntibus bonis." Were he to accept, he would have the blood of the Church laid at his door, and would be faced with the prospect of damnation. Therefore, at the very end, though the thought of violent death had made him weep four days before, he told the knights who had come to murder him: "If all the swords in England were pointed at my head, your terrors could not move me from the observance of God's justice and the obedience of our Lord, the Pope."

This rigidity, this "unbent steadfastness even to the blood of his crown," as the author of the Thomas Saga called it, owed much to Becket's natural temperament and his canonical training; but, as the quarrel dragged itself out from year to year, we can see it being strengthened by an absorption in spiritual things and a growth in sanctity. Not only have we the testimony of his spiritual father, Robert of Merton, and the descriptions, by those who knew him, of his prayer, penance and dependence upon God at Canterbury, Pontigny and St. Columba's; but the change is mirrored in his letters. As his exile continued he turned less and less to legal and canonical arguments, and abandoned Gratian for the Scriptures and the following of Christ. His mind was always naturally clear; but it was now sharpened by a spiritual perception which gave him such an insight into the real nature of the issue that even Louis confessed all to have been blind save Becket.

So much for the man and his motives. How did he regard the issue? Whatever we might think now, whatever contemporaries thought, he believed that it was one "*qua nulla specialior est Ecclesiae*."¹ It was not a mere struggle for historic customs, to be fought out on the level of expediency, but a life and death struggle for the Freedom of the Church for which Christ had poured out His Blood. That phrase runs like a refrain through his letters. Unfortunately the words underlined were so much a part of his thought that he took their meaning completely for granted and in applying them slid from one sense to another with bewildering ease. He could speak of the *libertas* of a single Church, or of the English Church, or, again, of the Church of God; he could use it in a concrete way; then, almost in the same breath, treat it as an abstraction. Still, his use of *libertas* does open a door into his mind. He seems to have regarded the freedom of the

¹ What follows is based mainly on his analysis of the Constitutions (e.g. *Mat.* III, 268-72 and 280-85) and the lists of condemned "Heads" which suggest what he regarded as the principles at stake (e.g. II, 380; V, 384, 394, 387-8; VI, 265). His views on the relation of the Two Powers are to be found scattered about in the letters and speeches, but most conveniently in V. 274-78; 278-82; 518-20. To these letters must be added his speeches at Westminster in 1163 (III, 268-72) and at Northampton (II, 332-33). Cp. IV, 210, etc. From all this we can easily work out his theory of Church and State; it was that of the Reformers. Foliot (V, 532-35) differed from him on the nature of kingship, and the authority of the king: allowing to royalty considerable rights of interference in the judicial functions of the Church. This divergence led to quite a different view of the legality of the Constitutions (V, 539).

Church as synonymous with certain practical privileges or "freedoms," the maintenance of which was essential to the well-being of the Church because they were the external manifestation of its very essence. What these privileges were in the concrete, he made clear in his analysis of the Constitutions of Clarendon. They were : freedom of ecclesiastical jurisdiction ; freedom of election ; above all, freedom of intercourse with Rome. A comparison of these "freedoms" with the rights which the Church had forced Stephen to concede in his charter of 1136 suggests the idea that as Henry was demanding a return to the system which his Grandfather had enforced, so Becket was demanding the maintenance of the system which Henry had found in possession at his accession.

In practice the struggle had to be fought out in the field of practical projects and concrete liberties. But Becket seems to have realized that the choice really lay between the pre-Hildebrandine ideas regarding Church and State, and the system which had emerged triumphant from the Investiture Contest. Underlying the obstinacy of his stand was the realization that a far deeper issue was at stake. He was fighting for something intangible : the real, fundamental *libertas* that lay concealed beneath the outward forms : "Animam ecclesiae, quae est libertas, sine qua nec viget ecclesia, nec valet adversus eos qui quaerunt haereditate sanctuarium Dei possidere." In his eyes God's plan for the constitution of society was at stake : a society which he thought of, not as a fusion of two independent powers, but as the Church in its wider sense. For him it was not a question of fitting the Church into the State ; it was the Church which was the totality, the "communitas totius orbis," but which had two Kings, two laws, two jurisdictions, to coercive powers. There could be no true liberty, no fulfilling of God's plan for right world order, without the mutual co-operation of these two powers, or without the acknowledgment by the State that it was as inferior to the Church as lead is to gold. To some the quarrel might seem a "scintilla cujusdam indignationis," but Becket was convinced of its importance. Henry's demand involved not merely the submission of the spiritual to the temporal power in one corner of the globe ; rather, on the issue of the controversy hung the fate of Christendom. The whole of Europe was looking on, and if he did not resist, the evil example would spread until the Church throughout the world would be subjected and its liberty reduced to bondage. As he told Alexander, after Fréteval, had he failed "the liberty of the Church would have been completely destroyed, the authority of divine law would have perished, the customs, or rather, the abuses of ancient tyrants would have flourished, the Bishop of Rome would have been unknown in England and the privileges of the Spouse of Christ would have been wiped out without hope of recovery. As he had said at Gisors six years before, he could not compromise "because it would be a pernicious example and issue in the

ruin of ecclesiastical liberty and, perhaps, even in the downfall of the Christian faith."

Such would seem to have been his view of the issue at stake. Men may discuss how far it sprang from natural obstinacy and pride, or from the piercing insight of sanctity. At least Becket held to it consistently. How completely true this is may be seen by comparing his analysis of the conflict in 1170 with (for example) his letters of 1163 before the issue had come to a head at all ; or with his analysis of the Constitutions in 1164, and his letters to the Bishops and to Foliot in 1166 in which he ranges over the whole matter of the controversy. His consistency becomes even clearer when we study his attitude to the various proposals made at the series of conferences held before Fréteval. As the years wore on his analysis of the question remained unaltered ; but his motives and arguments became less canonical and more scriptural and spiritual. In the later stages of the story it is difficult to square his zeal for the vindication of Papal authority, and his fear of giving bad example and having the blood of the Church required at his hands, with any theory of purely natural stubbornness, still less of self-centredness. We might not agree with his analysis of the facts ; we might think that he exaggerated the dangers ; or that there is much to be said for the other side : but the evidence makes it clear that he at least knew why he fought, and knew the reason for his death. " We are all to die, and must not be turned from justice by the fear of death," he had said. As he fell beneath the blows of his assailants he was heard to murmur : " For the name of Jesus and the defence of the Church I am prepared to die."

J. GILLICK

SHORT NOTICE

The Darkness is Passed : Daily Religion for Every Man (Clonmore & Reynolds, Dublin, 8s. 6d.), by Fr. Thomas A. Moore, S.J., should help many readers. His informal meditations are largely drawn from the scenes of the New Testament, and are written in an easy conversational style with a good deal of useful local colouring about habits and manners of the time in which Our Lord lived. The chapters are short, and in each it is always possible to grasp some single sentence which embodies a useful lesson. Thus in the short chapter on " The Spouse of Mary," Fr. Moore says casually (after telling a pretty story about a Jewish family), " St. Joseph is *that* close to us. Perhaps this is why we find it so difficult to see the holiness of him." Some of the chapters are cast in the form of a colloquy with Our Lord. This adds variety to the method, and may help an inexperienced reader to learn how a meditation can be transferred from the pages of a book to the uses of the mind.

JESUS CHRIST IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH¹

THE number of books written about Christ our Lord, is legion. In the days of St. Luke men began to write accounts of Christ's life, and St. Luke himself wrote his Gospel to correct them or to improve upon them. From that time until to-day scarcely a year has passed without something new appearing about Christ, very often a "life" of Christ. Each age approaches Christ with something of its own ideas, presuppositions and prejudices ; but no age seems able to escape from some judgment about Christ, and books about Him have multiplied until they are almost countless. The fascination of Christ is limitless.

At the beginning of the last century a movement began, particularly among German scholars, for a return to "the historical Jesus" ; the mood was rationalistic and "critical." Scholars said : "The real Christ has been destroyed by the dogmatism of the Churches ; let us go back to history and discover what the real man was like. Miracles, of course, do not happen ; mysteries are outside the scope of scholarship, for the norm of truth is the human mind. Let us apply all the norms of documentary evidence to the Gospels and find out what this man really did and really said. Let us find 'the Jesus of History.' " Accordingly, they rejected the tradition of the Church, rejected all the Councils, especially Chalcedon, went back to the Gospels and subjected them to "criticism," accepting parts of them and rejecting other parts ; and there began a dreary procession of presentations of Christ which too often merely reflected the prejudices of various scholars. Christ became only a teacher of the Fatherhood of God and of the brotherhood of man, as with Harnack ; he became an embodiment of the Moral Ideal, as with Thomas Hill Green ; became more or less an "Apostle of Culture," as with Matthew Arnold ; an enthusiast for 'humanity,' with Seeley ; a forerunner of Socialist reformers, as with Frederick Maurice ; a teacher of self-redemption, with Edwin Arnold. E. R. Trattner, a Jew, in his book "As a Jew Sees Jesus," pointed out that "many biographies parade the Galilean in various national costumes. Renan's Jesus, for example, is a French waxen figure, a kind of gentle dreamer who walks about Palestine smiling at life. It has been said that Renan's refined Galileans, who make up the retinue of the charming Carpenter, might have been taken from the windows of an art shop in the Place de St. Sulpice ! Many German writers have loved to think of Jesus as essentially Teutonic. With an easy gaiety of spirit Bruce Barton gives us an American Jesus ! Jesus

¹ *The Christ of Catholicism, A Meditative Study.* By Dom Aelred Graham, Monk of Ampleforth. Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1947. 381 pages. 21s.

spoke of the faith which moves mountains ; but Barton would interpret that, in strictly American terms, as the faith that moves merchandise."

There is, of course, a certain exaggeration in what has just been cited. Many scholars wrote with immense erudition, and discovered a great deal about the customs and the background of the life of Christ. Nevertheless, the antecedent rejection of the miraculous, and the application to Christ of rationalistic principles, joined to a denial of the authenticity of the Gospel accounts, laid open all these 'lives' to a just charge of subjectivism and falsity. Albert Schweitzer, in his famous "*Quest of the Historical Jesus*" and Hilarin Felder, in his "*Christ and the Critics*," effectively demonstrated that most of the criticisms of the older writers cancelled one another out and left no "rationalistic" explanation able to withstand the devastating criticisms of other rationalists. More recently, indeed only last year, in a book which the reviews suggest has not been appreciated at its full worth, entitled "*Conflict in Christology*," a study of British and American Christology from 1880-1914, Mr. John Stewart Lawton wrote a most penetrating epitaph over the attempts of "liberal" theologians to defend the ancient faith on "critical" principles. Speaking of 'liberalism' in English theology, he says :

We have watched the development of this movement in thought, from the first beginnings of the acceptance of the principles of higher criticism and the casting asunder of the shackles of arbitrary dogmatism ; we have noted how this approach led to the belief in Christ's limited human intellect and the consequent problems relating to his authority and sinlessness ; we have observed how the introduction of still more incisive methods of criticism led to a further denuding of those supernatural and miraculous powers hitherto ascribed to Christ's Person ; and we have witnessed how that humanism, incipient in the previous stages of the conflict, at length succeeded in divesting Christ, not only of the expressions of God's physical attributes, but also of his unique nature and character, and dethroned him from his place of pre-eminence for the real life of mankind (p. 248).

The radical error, says Mr. Lawton, of 'liberal' theology was the rejection of the tradition of the Church :

Liberal theology made the attempt to interpret the New Testament as it pleased, in the light of its own pre-conceived principles : some of the results of that attempt have been seen in this volume, others, even more grotesque, may be seen in a book such as Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus*. For the New Testament, decisive though it ultimately is, is but the testimony of one generation of Christian thought to the facts of redemption and revelation. But the Church, in Christ and the Holy Spirit, has lived many generations ; and if the doctrine of the Incarnation and of the Church which flows from it be taken seriously, it is impossible to ignore the cumulative authority for Christian truth which those generations of faith and study possess, and demand from the present age, in the way of submission and active co-operation (p. 249).

Dom Aelred's book, "The Christ of Catholicism," tries to meet this need of our time. His plan is to present Christ as the universal mind of the Church has understood him; and to present what St. Augustine calls "the whole Christ," which includes Christ's life after his resurrection in his mystical body, with all which that implies. Christ cannot be understood merely by studying the Gospels; He becomes intelligible only when his earthly life is placed against the background of his life extended into the Church, by whose faith alone can He be grasped as He is, and even as He actually was in his earthly life. Accordingly, after an introductory chapter justifying his standpoint, and explaining that he is writing neither formal theology, nor pure piety, but a combination of both, Dom Aelred has a long chapter about the earthly life of our Lord, with considerations of his moral teaching and his doctrine; then a chapter about his personality as Messiah, Son of God, Incarnate Word, God-man and a divine Person; then a chapter on the Redemption, dealing with Christ as Mediator, Prophet, Priest and King; and then two long chapters on the consequences of the Incarnation, that is, the Spirit of our Lord and the rôle of the Mother of God. He ends with a chapter on the Kingdom of God and the Mystical Body of Christ.

So broad a scope obviously has its difficulties; necessary brevity may lead to incompleteness; the technical questions involved may lead to obscurity, or the disputed matters to controversialism. If Dom Aelred has not wholly overcome these inherent difficulties, he yet writes very clearly and understandably, and, above all, with a serenity and urbanity worthy of the best Benedictine tradition. Noteworthy is his method of quoting Scripture, for he uses (to a casual reader almost indifferently) five different translations: the Douay, Fr. Spencer's, Mgr. Knox's, the Westminster, and occasionally his own version of one or other text. The result is to make Scripture easily understood, though I for one would here and there have preferred a different reading.

In giving some account of this notable work, one is torn between a desire to quote many of the excellent things said, and to pursue some of the momentous issues raised. Perhaps nothing in the book is better said than the conclusion expressed at the very end of the work (but implicit in the whole), that there is no way to God or to salvation, either after this life or during it, save through Christ: "When so many are at a loss to discover a meaning for their existence, it should be encouraging to find that the incarnate Word brings them not only eternal salvation but a coherent philosophy of life. We cannot live simply at a rational level, still less on a basis of mere sensation; intellect and sense alike call for their fulfilment, the latter in subordination to the former. Ultimately they can achieve this only in the harmonious unity of the Word made flesh. Those of our progressive contemporaries who imagine that they can transcend institutional

Christianity, to reach a 'mystical' communion with the Absolute without reference to the humanity of Christ, are deceived when they think themselves enlightened; in reality they have a closer kinship with the absurdities and superstitions of the early Gnostics—the 'intellectuals' of the first and second centuries—than with the great religious thinkers of the past. To the mind which relies on reason alone, now as in St. Paul's day, the Cross of Christ must always appear 'folly'; to those who live in the light of faith, possessors of the true *gnosis*, it remains 'the power of God and the wisdom of God' " (p. 345). If there be any tempted to be intellectuals and to find something a little material, or even a little vulgar, in the Catholic devotions to the Sacred Heart of Christ and to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, we commend the delicate and sympathetic considerations of Dom Aelred in his chapter on the God-man, and on the rôle of the Mother of God. The Incarnation divinizes not only the human soul, but the human being who is made up of both body and soul; and consequently divinizes human affections and human feelings.

Dom Aelred is convinced that no merely argumentative approach to the "evidences of the Gospels" will convince men. The approach must be to the whole man and to his instinctive response to truth and goodness; one may say that the appeal must be of the whole to the whole, the whole Christ to the whole man. For this reason, Dom Aelred does not separate consideration of the miracles from the doctrine, nor the claim of being a "divine legate" from the claim of being equal to God; and he does not separate Christ's appeal as giver of truth from his appeal as searcher of the heart. He insists upon the need of humility of heart, and of divine enlightenment, before one can even grasp the significance of Christ:

A consistent historical account from the point of view of scientific study, is an impossible task; the reason being that the hidden unity of Christ's life which is itself the key to the full understanding of his human history, namely the person of the God-Man, is, as we have seen, not human and historical at all. The Incarnation is a fact of history in that it took place at a definite point in time; but He who became incarnate, God's only begotten Son, remains eternally above the temporal sequence of events. This is why, as Brunner has pointed out, Christ is always a disturbing factor to the secular historian: not on account of any absence of data, which are indeed abundant, but because He cannot be fitted into any existing historical category. Such an historian is aware of his embarrassment, without, however, being able to explain it. The truth is that the historical appearance of Jesus is itself determined by the mystery of his divine personality; and it is just this which presents the historian, as such, with an insoluble problem. Only one who has entered, through faith, into something of the viewpoint of Jesus himself, can even begin to understand his significance (p. 262).

Dom Aelred repeats the same idea when speaking of the miracles of

Christ : they were symbols of God's goodness, and only good will could rightly respond to them :

Considered as mere evidences they were not sufficient to produce belief ; there was needed the inward enlightenment of the mind and heart for which they were the occasion. For all the persuasive power of the miracles of Christ, they would not have sufficed to make refusal to accept him inexcusable had they not been accompanied, for the unbelievers, by an interior grace of illumination which revealed their true significance. . . . From the point of view of Christian apologetics, it should be remembered that the supreme motive of credibility is not the miracles, but the character of him who worked them. This was the influence which could subjugate all hearts, a light irresistibly alluring to those who did not voluntarily close their eyes. The charm and majesty of the mere presence of Jesus, his unblemished holiness, the serenity which distinguished him from the Old Testament prophets, the manifest good will, at once so accessible and so resourceful, the incomparable teaching, proclaimed with such divine assurance, in a manner so different from that of the Jewish Rabbis—these are what constituted the most impressive "miracle" of all. Even had there been no miracles, men ought still to have believed in Jesus Christ ; for he both personified, and could bring to bear upon the soul, the appeal and illumination of ultimate Truth, loved instinctively by every creature. To resist this inward impulsion is suicide for the intelligence, a sin only to be explained by perversity of heart. That our Lord chose to corroborate his message with miracles only made the enormity the greater. "If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin ; but now they have no excuse for their sin. . . . If I had not done among them the works that no other hath done, they would not have sin ; but now they have seen and they have hated both me and my Father" (John 15, 22) (p. 82).

Now it is true that the evidential value of a miracle can scarcely be weighed without reference to its whole context : especially to the doctrine taught by the worker of miracles, and to his character. It is true, likewise, that Christ did draw men to the truth (apart from his miracles) by giving them interior illumination to enable them to understand his doctrine. At the same time, is it true to say that there was need of an interior illumination (over and above right reason and good will) in order to enable a beholder to understand that the claims and teaching of Christ were guaranteed and ratified by his miracles, by this evidence of divine power at work ? Christ himself said : "If you cannot trust my word . . . , let these powerful acts themselves be my warrant" (John 14, 11). Some Christian apologists have laid undue stress upon the merely rationalistic import of the miracles, so to speak ; to the neglect of their wider context, and of the need of eyes to see their real meaning. The Vatican Council warned us against any excessive reliance upon merely internal criteria of revelation, and defined that the fact of

revelation could be made believable by external signs ; which signs are miracles and prophecies demonstrating God's omnipotence and infinite wisdom (Denz. 1790 and 1812, 1813). It is here that the school of Kierkegaard, Barth and Brunner go wrong. Much as they rightly insist upon God's transcendence, and upon the need of approaching the Gospels in a humble spirit, still they minimize the need of a rational justification for faith. One may wish, then, that Dom Aelred, who cites them more than once with approval (cf. pp.4, 262, 228), had done more than merely refer in a note to Barth's "anti-intellectual fideism," and had made his disagreement more manifest.

Generally Dom Aelred avoids all discussion of the problems connected with the Incarnation ; and though this has its advantages, principally that of holding attention to the main truth without any complications, nevertheless one wonders if readers capable of understanding the book might not be capable also of understanding the problems involved, the attempts of Catholic theologians to solve them, and the wide divergencies between the solutions they propose. The impression given of all this tends a little to be too smooth ; sounds even, perhaps, a bit complacent ; if the book gains in serenity it loses somewhat in profundity. The authors cited in the index include no Catholic theologian between St. Thomas Aquinas and the late nineteenth century ; and in the Bibliographical Note, only one author is cited, Billot, who wrote on the Incarnation in Latin. In a book entitled "The Christ of Catholicism" Catholic writers deserve better than this.

Upon the nature of personality Dom Aelred has a consideration with which by no means all Catholics will agree. He stresses the error of thinking that personality is developed and enhanced by being independent ; and urges that the full development of personality lies in independence of what is below us and in dependence upon God. Then he proceeds : "There is grave need for a fresh recognition of the truth that the human personality matures by effacing itself before God and being united, so far as this may be, with the divine personality. This is at length being acknowledged, amid much confused theorizing, by the experimental psychologists : But whoever is unable to lose his life by the same token will never gain it (So Jung). Thus we are enabled faintly to catch a glimpse of how the human nature of Jesus was in no way diminished by being so intimately united to God as to enjoy, not a human, but a divine personality. At the first moment of the Incarnation, in the ontological depths of the God-Man, there was realized in a sublime degree the principle that human personality is enhanced by effacing itself before God. The manhood of Christ was so enveloped and permeated by the Godhead as to possess, not its own, but *his*, God's, personality" (p. 209).

Surely there is confusion here : for nothing can "mature," much less a personality, by its effacing itself *until it completely ceases to exist* :

and this must be the meaning here, if the example of the non-existent human personality of Christ is, in any real sense, a means of enlightenment as to what constitutes true personality. How is it possible, even in the "ontological depths of the God-Man," for a human personality to enhance itself by ceasing to exist at all? The fallacy is one not uncommon in speaking of matters connected with the Incarnation: the fallacy of making the humanity of Christ a subject about which one can speak as if it existed in its own right. The manhood of Christ most certainly did not possess God's personality; the Son of God possessed it, which is a very different thing. The losing of one's life to find it is indeed a paradox; but the paradox consists precisely in the fact that life becomes greater and fuller by what *seems* to destroy it, not by what actually does destroy it. Nothing can be by not being.

Perhaps Dom Aelred is less happy in his treatment of our Lady. Though much is truly, and sometimes beautifully, said, there is something rather laboured in the treatment. Perhaps this is due to the vast subjects covered: the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption, the Mediatorship of all grace. And perhaps also to the too narrow conception within which the work of Christ as the author of atonement and of grace is presented. Dom Aelred hinges his whole consideration of the role of our Lady in God's redemptive plan upon the metaphor of a ransom paid: Christ paid the ransom, and he alone could pay it; but our Lady, because she surrendered her maternal rights in accepting the Cross, and because of her close union with God, is in a special position in regard to the distribution of the graces which Christ has paid for. Now this is indeed true as far as it goes; but it overlooks complexities involved in the ideas of the redemption and of grace. To force everything into the one metaphor, of a ransom paid, impoverishes our idea of the 'divinization' of humanity through the Incarnation; and tends to imagine grace as if it were goods bought in a shop and distributed by a purchaser. The Greek Fathers, though they admit the ransom idea, tend to make less use of such juridical or commercial metaphors; they employ rather, the parallel of a healing principle introduced into humanity by the hypostatic union, the comparison of an image defaced and then restored: the Incarnation having restored in mankind the image in which man was originally created. St. Thomas uses the comparison of ransom only as *one* way of expressing the manner in which Christ wrought our salvation; in his writings merit, satisfaction, sacrifice, redemption, contact of divine power, all these words enter into the expression of the different relationships involved in the one great work of human salvation. Theologians to-day are tending to investigate more exactly the nature of grace, and to picture it more as a personal relationship to the Holy Ghost than as a passport to heaven (though, obviously, the two ideas are not mutually exclusive). It is against this background of a widening conception of the redemption, and of grace, that our Lady's rôle

in the economy of salvation must be placed ; and it may not be indiscreet to say that perhaps a growing realization of the complexities of the problems involved has slackened the desire for some definition of our Lady's mediatorship in our redemption. Of all this Dom Aelred's treatment gives no indication ; one is left with an impression that doctrinal aspects of these mysteries are more definitely fixed than they actually are.

An instance is the following passage : " Our Lady obtains grace for us by her intercession ; but she is not the source of grace, since this is Christ's inalienable prerogative. ' The Blessed Virgin gives (*redundavit*) grace to us in such a way, however, that she can in no sense be considered the author of grace ' (Thomas, *In Ioan*, 1, lect. 10). Nor is she even the instrument, as are the sacraments. Mary does not share the unique grace (*gratia capitalis*) which belongs to Christ as the Head of the Church. Moreover, the idea of a sacrament—a physical instrument of grace effecting what it signifies—is clearly inapplicable to our Lady. Here it should be noted that her rôle as Co-redemptrix and Mediatrix of graces derives from God's absolutely free decree ; it is ordained by him, and inserted, so to say, within the total economy of grace, according to his designs. Now the sacramental system is essential to that economy ; whence it follows that those graces which God wills to give us expressly by means of the sacraments do not call for, though they do not necessarily preclude, Mary's direct intercession " (p. 290).

With more than one thing here Catholics need not agree. Many theologians strongly deny that a sacrament is a physical instrument of grace ; and though they may be mistaken their view is fully orthodox. Others might very well hold without rebuke that Mary's Mediatorship is as essential to the whole economy of grace as is the sacramental system itself, and that her universal mediatorship of graces does include her direct intervention even in the conferring of sacramental graces. However, such points are of relatively minor importance. They are only mentioned here as instances of the hidden rocks which may beset the course of the most skilful theologian. They are not to be taken as obscuring the merits of the very notable book which Dom Aelred has written, or the value of the many good things which it contains.

BERNARD M. LEEMING

CARDINAL ALLEN'S ADMONITION

I

NO writings of Cardinal Allen, it is probably true to say, so incensed the Councillors of Queen Elizabeth, as did the "Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and Ireland," and the summary of it, printed as a proclamation or broadside under the title, "A Declaration of the Sentence and Deposition of the usurper and pretended Queen of England."¹ Though printed at Antwerp in 1588 in readiness to be distributed on the landing of the Spanish troops, these writings were never published because of the failure of that Armada. The English Government, however, managed to secure a copy both of the Admonition and the Declaration, while they were being printed, and made a despicable and deceitful use of the latter in the trial of the Earl of Arundel. Though, as Father Pollen remarked, any child who understood the terms could see that it was not a Bull, the Government deliberately represented it as such, and as being issued at the earnest solicitations of the Earl.²

Both writings are essentially manifestos, called forth by the occasion of the Spanish Armada and designed to show, as Allen declares, "how just, honest and necessary causes all true Englishmen have to embrace and set forward the same, seeing it proceedeth from so lawful authority, so just grounds, so holy intentions, and tendeth to so happy an end and is to be executed by so sure and sweet means and chosen persons."³ In the Admonition Allen portrays a picture of Queen Elizabeth and her Government that is in striking contrast to the laudatory descriptions of the reign in popular tradition and in historical textbooks. It is not surprising that the Government should have been incensed by it; for the language at times is extremely strong and virulent. To judge the work, however, apart from the occasion or from its virulence alone, as critics for the most part appear to have done, is an error; and a still greater error of historical perspective would be to appraise the work by the greater urbanity in expression of our own times, though two world wars have perhaps shown sufficiently that that urbanity is, after all, little more than skin deep. The sixteenth century was an age of strong feeling and strong expression of it, as any one knows who has even a passing acquaintance with the

¹ The British Museum possesses an original copy of the *Admonition*, which, one gathers from the Short Title Catalogue, is the only one known to be extant. What purports to be a facsimile reproduction of it was edited by Eupator (J. Mendham) in 1842. Copies of the Declaration are still extant in the Bodleian and one or two other libraries in England. It was printed by Canon Tierney in his edition of *Dodd's Church History* (Vol. III, p. XLIV) from an original in his possession.

² Cf. *The Ven. Philip Howard*, edited by J. H. Pollen, S.J. C.R.S. XXI, pp. 166-175, 218, 251 and 282.

³ Mendham's edition, p. viii. In quotations from the *Admonition*, I have modernised the spelling.

controversial literature of the period. The constant railing at the Pope as Antichrist on the part of the Protestants, and their language, blasphemous to Catholic ears, concerning the Mass and the ceremonies of the old Faith, afforded Allen more than sufficient example and precedent. Even at his greatest virulence he never descended to the depths of scurrility of John Bale, the Protestant Bishop of Ossory, to mention but one name. The essential point is not the style or language of the pamphlet, however much it may be deplored, but the truth or falsity of the description of Queen Elizabeth and her Government. "It is to be feared," wrote a non-Catholic author, "that the facts stated therein are but too true and cannot be denied or disproved. As paragraph after paragraph is faithfully and impartially considered, melancholy though the strong and plain-spoken expressions and charges appear, yet it is impossible with any honesty to deny that they are in the main, and unhappily, correct and only too true."¹

In the introductory pages of the pamphlet Allen points out that the change of religion had not been the spontaneous work of the people, as had been the case in some lands, but that it had been imposed on the realm by the rulers who had usurped sovereignty even over the souls of their subjects; nobility, priests and people yielding thereto not by free consent, but by force and fear. To this Pope Sixtus had now undertaken to apply a remedy, aided by the most zealous and mighty princes of Christendom, and with more hope and readier help than they could possibly have desired or deserved. There was no cause for fear. Neither the body of the Commonwealth nor any part of it, save such few as would not follow "this offer of God's ordinance," would suffer any ill consequences. The purpose of the Pope was "to pursue the actual deprivation of Elizabeth the pretended Queen, declared and judicially sentenced by his predecessors Pius V and Gregory XIII for a heretic and usurper, and the proper present cause of perdition for millions of souls at home, and the very bane of all Christendom and states about her."

Allen then proceeds to set down "what manner of woman she is against whom this holy enterprise is made: of whom and in what manner descended: how intruded into that dignity wherein she standeth: how she hath behaved herself both at home and abroad."

Offspring of an adulterous and incestuous union,² she has no right to the crown of England, "having been most justly declared illegitimate and incapable of succession—and that as well by the sentence of the said Paul III and of his predecessor, Clement VII, in the year of our Lord, 1533, (both which stand in their full force still) as by sundry Acts of Parliament made by Henry himself and never repealed, legitimating her sister and declaring her to be base." There is some

¹ F. G. Lee, *The Church under Queen Elizabeth*. London, 1880, vol. II, p. 192.

² Allen is here probably referring to the current report that Anne Boleyn was Henry VIII's own daughter. For discussion of this report see David Lewis's translation of N. Sander's *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, London, 1877, pp. xxiv-xlvii.

inaccuracy in this passage. The statute 28 Henry VIII recognized the king's marriage with Anne Boleyn to be null and void because of 'just, true and lawful impediments' unknown at the time of the marriage, but since confessed by Anne to Cranmer.¹ It accordingly declared Elizabeth illegitimate and inheritable, and thus far repealed the statute 25 Henry VIII which had decreed the marriage with Anne valid, and Elizabeth in default of male heirs to be Henry's successor. But it did not repeal that Act so far as it recognized the nullity of Henry's marriage with Katherine, and by consequence the illegitimacy of Mary. On the contrary, it reaffirmed that nullity and explicitly declared Mary to be illegitimate. To call either Mary or Elizabeth legitimate was, in fact, made high treason. Henry himself never recognized the legitimacy either of Mary or Elizabeth. The Statute 35 Henry VIII, it is true, fixed the succession on Edward and his heirs, then on Mary and her's, and finally on Elizabeth, provided always that both Mary and Elizabeth observed the conditions, if any, that might be laid down by Letters patent of Henry or by his last will; but they are both simply called Henry's daughters and nothing is said about their legitimacy. It was Mary, and not Henry, who by her first Parliament, repealing part of the statute 25 Henry VIII, declared that the marriage of the king with Katherine had been valid, and Mary therefore to be legitimate. The illegitimacy of Elizabeth followed as a consequence, though the Act made no explicit mention of it.² Mary's example was not followed by Elizabeth. Neither the statute 28 Henry declaring her to be illegitimate nor the statute 1 Mary from which her illegitimacy followed as a consequence were repealed. Her first Parliament simply declared that she was and ought to be rightful and lawful queen, rightly, lineally and lawfully descended and come of the blood royal. Subsequently it reversed the attainder of Anne Boleyn and restored Elizabeth in blood: a measure which certainly appears to contradict its aforesaid declaration.³

Allen, however, rejects this Parliamentary title, though his reason for doing so appears to be unfounded. "Neither may she here allege," he writes, "that by consent of the states and Commonwealth she is lawfully possessed; for that by force she intruded and constrained many men to give their consent to deposing unjustly the Lords of the Clergy, without which no lawful Parliament can be holden in that realm nor statute made which hath force to authorise prince or bind subject." Here he seems to be confusing the illegality of the Acts that established the new religion with that declaring her rightful succession. The Catholic bishops as a body had, indeed, refused to crown Elizabeth, though Ogelthorpe, Bishop of Carlisle, probably not without some form of pressure, was eventually persuaded to perform the

¹ 8 Henry VIII c.VII. Previous to this Parliament Cranmer had declared the nullity of the marriage for "true, just and lawful reasons lately brought to his knowledge."

² 1 Mary, c.1.

³ Cf. Lingard, *History*, Vol. VI, pp. 12 and 13.

ceremony. But the Act declaring Elizabeth lawful occupant of the throne was passed in the two Houses of Parliament before the imprisonment of the Catholic bishops; nor, unless the previous refusal to crown her be taken as a rejection of her claims, does there seem to have been any protest against this Act on the part of the Spirituality. It may be that Allen did take the refusal to crown her as a refusal to recognize her as queen, for he mentions the fact later; but it is by no means clear that he did so.

A further argument for the illegality of the queen's succession, is, he urges, that "she never had consent nor any approbation of the See Apostolic, without which she nor any other can be lawful king or queen of England by reason of the ancient accord, made between Alexander III the year 1171 and Henry II then King, when he was absolved for the death of St. Thomas of Canterbury, that no man might lawfully take that crown nor be accounted as king till he was confirmed by the sovereign Pastor of our souls, which for the time should be: this accord afterwards being renewed about the year 1210 by King John who confirmed the same by oath to Pandulphus, the Pope's legate, at the special request and procurement of the Lords and Commons as a thing necessary for the preservation of the realm from unjust usurpation of tyrants and avoiding other inconveniences which they had proved and might easily fall again by the disorder of some wicked king."

Such an argument shows Allen's medieval outlook, but considering the purpose of the Admonition it is surprising that he urged it, even though the facts he recorded be true. A claim, though historically justified, that had fallen into desuetude and had been, at least negatively, rejected by the sovereigns of England not heeding it for over two centuries, was not likely to make much appeal to the Englishmen of Elizabeth's days.

"But however she be descended or possessed of the crown," Allen continues, "her manifold wickedness hath been so heinous and intolerable that for the fame thereof she hath been in person justly deposed by the sentence of sundry Popes."¹ He then proceeds for eighteen pages to enumerate her crimes.

"And to begin with the highest and most heinous crime of all against God and his Church, she is convicted of many damnable heresies, and open rebellion against God's Church and See Apostolic for which she is so notoriously known and taken for a heretic as well at home as abroad that she was glad to provide by a special act of Parliament that none should call her heretic, schismatic, tyrant and usurper or infidel under pain of high treason."²

¹ In reality only one Bull was published. Though the excommunication was renewed by Gregory XIII, it was never published, as the occasion for which it was intended never arose. Cf. *C.R.S.*, XXXIX, pp. xlv and 349. It would, doubtless, have been renewed by Sixtus V at an opportune moment, but owing to the failure of the Armada that moment never came.

² 13 Elizabeth c.1. Bd. John Nelson was condemned to death for asserting that the Queen was a schismatic and a heretic "being drawn thereunto by the commissioners' captious interrogatories." Allen, *True, Sincere and Modest Defence*, 1914 ed., vol. 1, p. 227.

"She usurpeth by Luciferian pride the title of supreme ecclesiastical government, a thing in a woman in all men's memory unheard of, not tolerable to the masters of her own sect and to Catholics in the world most ridiculous, absurd, monstrous, detestable, and a very fable to the posterity."¹

"She is guilty of perjury and high impiety for that she did break violate and deride the solemn oath and promises made in her coronation." This is a point that needs to be emphasized; for it is too often passed over in discreet silence. At her coronation Elizabeth promised under oath as her predecessors had done for centuries before, "to grant and keep the laws, customs and franchises granted to the clergy by the glorious king St. Edward; to keep peace and godly agreement entirely according to her power, both to God, to the holy Church, to the clergy and the people; to preserve unto the bishops and to the churches committed to their charge, all canonical privileges and due law and justice, and to protect and defend them, as every good king in this kingdom ought to be protector and defender of the bishops and church under their government."²

Yet when Elizabeth took this oath she was already contemplating the religious changes that ensued as well as her treatment of the Catholic bishops. "It is, indeed, hard," wrote Father Pollen, "to qualify Elizabeth's duplicity over this oath with the severity it deserves. Taking it in connection with the new laws which had been resolved upon in The Device, which were brought into the Houses of Parliament so soon after the service, it reveals to us a mind whose perfidy and cruelty it would be hard to equal."³

"She did immediately upon her intrusion," continues Allen, "against all law and order (the whole clergy and many of the nobility and commons reclaiming) to the perdition of infinite souls, abolish the whole Catholic religion and faith that all the former kings of our country have lived and died in;—by which she severed herself and her subjects violently from the society of all Catholic countries and from fellowship of all faithful princes and priests in the world."⁴

¹ For similar phrases as regards the supremacy, cf. Allen, *Apologie*, ff. 10v. and 47v; *True Sincere and Modest Defence*, vol. I, p. 17 and vol. II, pp. 72 and 128. He comments on her pride in a postscript to his letter to Como, Rheims, 12 September, 1580. Cf. also Allen to Philip II, Rome, 30 March, 1587, Knox, *Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen*, pp. 91 and 287. For the rejection by Continental Protestants of the supremacy, cf. "Elizabethan Supremacy and Contemporary Writers," *The Month*, November, 1947, pp. 216 ff.

² It is agreed that the coronation of Elizabeth was carried out according to the rite prescribed by the *Liber Regalis*. A translation of the oath is given in the *Coronation Ceremonial* by H. Thurston, S.J. London, 1914, from which the above phrases are cited.

³ J. H. Pollen, S.J., *English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, London, 1920, p. 25. Cf. also Allen's *Defence of Sir William Stanley's Surrender of Deventer*, 1851 ed., p. 24. The Device for the Alteration of Religion is printed in H. Gee, *The Elizabethan Prayer Book with the two other schemes drawn up for the Government*. Its main features are summarised in "Elizabeth's Early Persecution of Catholics," *The Month*, April, 1926, p. 300.

⁴ Cf. Allen, *Apologie*, f. 35v; J. H. Pollen, S.J., "The Passing of Elizabeth's Supremacy," *The Dublin Review*, June, 1903; and H. Belloc, *History of England*, vol. IV, pp. 291–296. The final consequences of the disruption of European unity by the Reformation are being felt acutely in our own time.

"She did at the same time abolish all the holy sacraments of Christ's Church and above all other in particular the very blessed and sovereign sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, creating for the same, and in disgrace thereof, high idolatry and polluted bread of schism and abominable desolation."¹

"She did shut up both pulpits and churches from all Catholic priests, preachers and people, and caused all God's public, true ancient honour service and solemnity, throughout the whole realm of England, (a most lamentable case), and not long after in Ireland, to cease upon one day, constraining by great penalties and extreme punishment many thousand poor Christian souls of every degree and sex, to forsake that faith and religion, in which they and all their forefathers were baptised and brought up ever since the realm was first converted to Christ, to the great torment of their minds and consciences and shortening of their days."²

"She impiously spoiled all sanctified places of their holy images, relics, memories and monuments of Christ our Saviour and of his Blessed Mother and saints, her own detestable cognisance and other profane portraiture exalted in their places: and therewith hath overthrown, destroyed and robbed all holy altars, chalices, vestments, church-books and sacred vessels, with whatsoever was consecrated to God's true worship."

In this passage Allen calls attention to one aspect of the method by which the new religion had been enforced upon the people—the wanton destruction deliberately organized by the Government of everything connected with the old Faith. Such destruction would have been within the memory of many of those for whom the book was intended, and was calculated to make its appeal as it had affected the daily life of the people. It still needs emphasising, as little attention is usually paid to this phase of the religious revolution. Referring to the Royal Visitation of 1559 to enforce the new Injunctions, Professor Kennedy writes, "Almost immediately a spirit of iconoclasm was let loose, as the Royal Visitors ordered the churchwardens in every parish to destroy all shrines, images and stained glass windows as monuments of the gross superstition abolished by Act of Parliament. Nor was the sacredness of the homes of the people respected. Search was made in them for images of the saints and for holy pictures and these were ruthlessly offered up to the new religion, any attempt to retain or conceal them being severely punished."³ "The records," he writes again, "of the wholesale destruction of the objects of Catholic piety are pitifully plentiful. It would be possible to take every class of church

¹ For similar phrases of Allen as regards the new rite cf. *True, Sincere and Modest Defence* vol. I, p. 52, and Allen to Vendeville, 16 September, 1578, Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

² He is referring to the Act of Uniformity, 1 Elizabeth, c. 2.

³ *Studies in Tudor History*, London, 1916, p. 167. W. P. M. Kennedy is the only historian, so far as I know, who has made a detailed study of this phase of the religious changes.

ornament and write a long chapter of its history, so wide are the documents at our disposal."¹

The allusion to the Queen's portraits in the above passage was a hit at Elizabeth's notorious vanity, which, indeed, exceeded all bounds. "It is seldom," wrote Lingard, "that females have the boldness to become heralds of their own charms; but Elizabeth, by proclamation, announced to her people that none of her portraits which had hitherto been taken of her person did justice to the original: that at the request of her council she had resolved to procure an exact likeness from the pencil of some able artist: that it should soon be published for the gratification of her loving subjects: and that on this account she strictly forbade all persons whomsoever to paint or engrave any new portraits of her features without licence, or to show or publish any of the old portraits till they had been reformed according to the copy to be set forth by authority."² This in 1563, and so she continued even in her old age. Referring to a dissension between Blount and Essex, the contemporary Osborne relates: "Nothing pleased her better than a conceit she had that her beauty (of which her flatterers had bred in her a higher esteem than an impartial ear or eye can think due from others reports on her own pictures) was the subject of this quarrel: when God knows it grew from the stock of honour of which then they were very tender."³

In his next paragraph Allen refers to the harsh treatment by the Government of the Catholic bishops, of which he had written in an earlier work. Here again Allen's account is found to be true and the statements of Burghley in his "Execution of Justice in England," false.⁴ In that pamphlet the Treasurer dismissed the idea that there had been any real imprisonment of the bishops by conceding there had just so far been an exception to their perfect freedom that they were at one period the quasi-guests of Elizabeth's hospitable bishops and by the statement that they "all enjoyed their life as the course of nature would." "Who could possibly have guessed from his words," wrote Father Bridgett, "that Watson of Lincoln had already (by 1583) spent four and twenty years in confinement; Thirlby of Ely nearly eleven; Bonner of London, ten; Bourne of Bath and Wells, Turberville of Exeter, Scott of Chester, Pate of Worcester and Haeth of York, more than three? Who could have gathered that the courteous White

¹ *Parish Life under Queen Elizabeth*, London, 1914, p. 49. This small volume gives the best account of the destructive side of the change of religion, which illustrates its revolutionary character. I have summarized his account in "Elizabeth's Early Persecution of Catholics," *The Month*, May, 1926, pp. 404 ff. From Professor Black's short notice of this destruction it might be inferred that after 1560 the Government tried to stop it. This is erroneous as a glance at the evidence produced by Kennedy will show.

² *History of England*, vol. VI, p. 657. He refers to the original proclamation corrected by Cecil in 1563 and printed in *Archeologia*, vol. II, pp. 169 and 170.

³ *Memoirs on the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James*, 1658, p. 32.

⁴ Allen's unanswerable reply to this pamphlet was published in 1584 under the title, *A True, Sincere and Modest Defence of English Catholics*. For his account of the treatment of the bishops, cf. vol. I, pp. 53, 58, 61 and 66-70.

of Winchester was kept in the Tower till he contracted a deadly sickness, and was then sent to his brother's house to die?"¹ Burghley knew these facts, but deliberately ran counter to them in his mendacious pamphlet.² Yet despite the exposure of his lies by Allen and in modern times by Bridgett and Phillips, the false tradition started by him still influences historians in their account of the treatment of the Catholic bishops.³

"She hath caused the priests of God," continues Allen, "to be plucked from the altar in the midst of the sovereign action, and to be carried in scornful manner revested through the streets and exposed to all the ungodly villainy, irrision, fury and folly of the simple and barbarous people; a thing certes that above all other kinds of irreligiosity most deserveth and soonest procureth God's vengeance."⁴ She hath suppressed all the religious houses of both sexes, so many as were restored after her father's former horrible spoil, dispersed the professed of the same, and robbed them of all their possessions." The annual net value, it may be remarked, of these confiscated religious houses and other church property that had been restored by Mary, was £25,000.⁵ This was a big sum in those days and denoted a considerable addition to the wealth of the crown; for the yearly yield of the crown revenue from all sources averaged for the first twenty nine years of the reign but £240,000.⁶

"She had by unjust and tyrannical statutes," Allen continues, "injuriously invaded the lands and goods of Catholic nobles and gentlemen, that for conscience sake have passed the seas: and molested, disgraced, imprisoned and spoiled many at home of all degrees because they would not give oath and agreement to her anti-Christian and unnatural proud challenge of supremacy, nor honour the idols of her profane board, whereby some provinces be in manner wholly bereaved of their just gentlemen in the administration of the laws, and the people annoyed by loss of so good lords and so great house-keepers, for lack of which the poor daily perish." Allen's general statement needs no elaboration. Abundant evidence of the unhappy lot of the persecuted Catholics both at home and abroad is supplied by the contemporary documents both official and unofficial. The opinion formerly held that the fine of one shilling for non attendance at the

¹ T. E. Bridgett and T. F. Knox, *The True Story of the Catholic Hierarchy*, London, 1889, p. 4. G. E. Phillips, *The Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy*, has shown that in some cases the periods of imprisonment were even longer than Bridgett stated.

² For an interesting instance of the Government's deliberate conspiracy to conceal the truth about the bishops in reference to Bullinger's reply to the Bull of Excommunication, cf. G. E. Phillips, *op. cit.* c. 111.

³ The influence of Burghley's statements can be seen in the works of Conyers Read and A. O. Meyer. The latest offender is Professor Black in his *Reign of Elizabeth*, Oxford, 1936, p. 16. In the light of the documents produced by Bridgett and Phillips his account can only be characterised as a gross under-statement.

⁴ Cf. *True, Sincere and Modest Defence*, vol. I, pp. 52 and 53. For an instance of a priest being so treated, cf. Strype, *Annals*, I, I, p. 54.

⁵ F. C. Dietz, *English Public Finance 1558-1641*, p. 8.

⁶ Cf. the tables in F. C. Dietz, *The Exchequer in Elizabeth's Reign*, 1923.

Protestant service—a sufficiently heavy burden by its continuance and according to the money value of those days and the rate of wages—was only intermittently exacted has been shown to be contrary to the evidence.¹ Later in 1581 an attempt to ruin the Catholic gentry was made by imposing a fine for recusancy of £20 per lunar month. The yield, indeed, from this monetary imposition became so considerable, especially after 1588, that it was used not merely as a means to reduce recusancy but as a fiscal measure to increase the revenue in the almost chronic financial difficulties of the Government.² Allen's further statement that these measures led to an increase in the number of paupers, so prominent a feature of the reign is interesting; for it is not generally mentioned as one cause of this problem of poverty.

After remarking that the change of religion had endangered the kingdom—and it was only the political ability of Burghley and the rivalry between France and Spain that saved it—Allen calls attention to the Queen's abasement of the old nobility, "repelling them from due government, offices and places of honour, thrusting them to shameful and odious offices of inquisition upon Catholic men, to the great vexation and terror of their own consciences, forcing them through fear and desire of her favour, and of her base leaders, to condemn that in others, which in their hearts and consciences themselves like of, and putting into their houses and chambers traitors, spials, delators and promoters, that take watch for her of all their ways, words and writings, by which the principal be already ruined most lamentably, and the rest stand in continual thralldom, danger and dishonour: so jealous be all tyrants and usurpers of their state, and so loath they are to be seconded by any other than of their own creation.

"She hath instead of the foresaid, and to their shame and despite advanced base and unpure persons, inflamed with infinite avarice and ambition, men of great partiality and iniquity to the highest honours and most profitable offices of her court and country, repelling from all public charge and authority under cover of religion the wisest, goodliest, learnedest and sincerest of all sorts of men, to the special annoyance and dishonour of the whole state."³

Allen's statement as regards the old nobility and the like was an echo of one of the complaints made in their proclamation by the Northern insurgents in 1569.⁴ Its truth is incontrovertible, and the statement may be said to have become a commonplace of Elizabethan history. The leaders of the Government, Burghley, Leicester, Knollys, Bacon and the rest were all men whom the scramble for wealth from the spoils of the Church or the amorous favours of the Queen had raised to political eminence. They were, moreover, closely allied to one another

¹ Cf. W. P. M. Kennedy, *Parish Life under Queen Elizabeth*, pp. 124–128, and his *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration*, Alcuin Club, 1924, vol. 1, pp. CXIX and CCI.

² Cf. F. C. Dietz, *Public Finance 1558–1641*, pp. 46, 54, 63 and 87 note.

³ Cf. also Allen, *True, Sincere and Modest Defence*, vol. I, pp. 97–101.

⁴ Cf. Cuthbert Sharpe, *Memorials of the Rebellion of 1569*, p. 42.

by marriage.¹ Their avarice was notorious. Besides gifts, loans, lucrative offices, monopolies, and the exclusive right to grant various licences, that she bestowed on them, she also forced her bishops, much against their wishes, to surrender to her rapacious courtiers and councillors, manors or long leases of them, pertaining to their sees. Leicester, Burghley, Walsingham, Hatton, Heneage, Essex and Carew, to mention but some, all benefited in this way at the expense of her bishops. In 1579 Leicester owed the Queen £21,000 and another of her favourites, Hatton, when he died in 1591, was £56,000 in her debt.² This scramble for wealth, indeed, affected all ranks. "We shudder to think," writes H. Hall, "that during the perils of the Armada the finances of the navy were administered by a pack of ravening wolves, according to the testimony of its official chief; that the armies of Elizabeth abroad were allowed to shiver and starve at the mercy of governors and patentees who embezzled the grants which should have clothed and fed them; that courtiers and wits flourished upon odious monopolies, and that judges grew fat upon extortionate bribes. With good reason we may call the Elizabethan a 'golden' age, for gold was the material divinity, and God and Mammon were by both high and lowly served with a zeal for which many of their descendants have cause to be grateful."³ Avarice and ambition, were in fact, as Allen had pointed out in a previous work, the driving forces behind the religious changes⁴: and when Burghley boasted of the prosperity of the country under the religious changes, he pertinently replied: "Shall we say the state is blessed? this regiment fortunate? all is peaceable and plentiful in England? Where indeed only a few newly raised by other men's fall, are made happy by other men's infelicity; and where a very small number, in comparison, have divided the wealth, honours, offices and pleasures of the whole land among themselves; and do manage the country by their favourites, to the discontentment, disgrace, and destruction of the justest gentlemen in the same."⁵ For while the few batten on the country, the number of paupers increased and became an ever more pressing problem for the government.

Nor can Allen's statement of the inquisitorial methods of the Government be doubted by any serious student of the period, though historians for the most part, occupied with the broader lines of policy, have little enough to say about this aspect of the Elizabethan regime. A complete picture of the system, moreover, can only be obtained by inspection of the contemporary diocesan and parochial records, to which

¹ H. Hall, *Society in the Elizabethan Age*, 5th ed., pp. 95 and 164.

² Cf. J. E. Neale, *Queen Elizabeth*, 1934, pp. 286 and 340.

³ H. Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

⁴ True, *Sincere and Modest Defence*, vol. II, p. 107. Cp. Dietz, *Public Finance*, p. 8: "It was apparent that the zealous regard for property rights among the powerful politicians of the country afforded as little likelihood that the former part of Mary's request (i.e. to maintain her religious settlement) would be granted as it did certainty that the latter (i.e. to pay her debts) would be carried out."

⁵ *Ibid.* vol. II, p. 1010. Cf. also Lingard, *op. cit.* pp. 664 and 665; H. Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

few appear to have had access. Professor Kennedy, one might say, is almost unique in researches of this kind, and from his unrivalled knowledge of such sources he arrived at a conclusion not dissimilar to that of Allen. "Nothing," he writes, "escaped the vigilant eyes of the Government. The homes of the people were at the mercy of the churchwardens, who practically became Government spies, and even the possession of a rosary or a sacred picture were considered a serious offence. Everywhere the Elizabethan ideal was forced on the people and the minutest details of their piety were watched both in public and private and reported to the authorities."¹ From the very beginning of the reign, indeed, the churchwardens—more than one, generally in a single parish—appear to have been the pivot of the system, and they in turn were rigorously controlled by the central authority.² With such agents and a host of spies and informers, with its searches and the invasion of the privacy of the home at any hour of day or night, with its use of appalling torture which gained England an unenviable reputation for cruelty, the system resembled the regime with which the modern world is so familiar in totalitarian states. Gestapo methods are no new invention. Elizabethan England knew them only too well.

L. HICKS, S.J.

¹ *Parish Life under Queen Elizabeth*, p. 121. Cf. also his *Tudor Studies*, pp. 177 and 183. On the invasion of the privacy of the home, cf. S. L. Ware, *The Elizabethan Parish in its Ecclesiastical and Financial Aspects*, Baltimore, 1908, p. 52, and Sir J. F. Stephen, *History of Criminal Law*, vol. II, p. 413.

² Cf. Ware, *op. cit.* pp. 16 and 26, and J. C. Cox, *Churchwardens Accounts*, p. 2.

SHORT NOTICE

Apart from Fr. Faber's treatise on the Sorrows of Our Lady, we have little in the English language of special value spiritually on this subject. All the more then is Fr. Hilary Morris' **Book of Meditations** (Burns and Oates, Price 6s.) to be welcomed. It sets out many truths in an attractive way, and on lines of solid theology and sound devotion. Everyone who loves Our Lady should possess this book. In just over a hundred pages, in clear and simple language, the author has considered first, Our Lady's griefs in general, and then the Seven Dolours properly so-called. In this second part of the little volume the gifts of the Holy Ghost are introduced and applied to the subject of Mary's sorrows. This tribute to Our Lady is further enhanced by some well produced illustrations from the Old Masters. We may add that the author is a Servite Father and so speaks with authority on his chosen theme.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

MAHATMA GANDHI

SINCE his tragic death at the hands of a misguided fellow Hindu, the Press and the leading public men in Britain and in the United States have had nothing but high praise for Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi—praise which showed the many-sidedness of his character and work. He has been hailed as one of the great figures of our age, as a prince among men, as a great servant of humanity, as an apostle and martyr of peace and non-violence, as an ascetic, prophet and saint. On the other hand it has also been said of him that he was the keenest of tacticians and a propagandist versed in all the arts of publicity, a perpetual enigma to both friends and critics.

No doubt there were very diverse personal reactions among the various people who came into contact with this elusive personality; yet, getting down to the bed-rock, so to say, of his character, one can confidently say that Gandhi had great gifts of heart and head. But I think it was his heart that was the dominant partner and showed the way. There was his profound religious spirit, his moral and social idealism, his almost infinite capacity for selfless sacrifice, his tenacity of purpose, his sincerity and courage, his wonderful patience and affectionateness. It was the broad masses of the people living in the remote villages of India who came nearest to taking the full measure of the man in their own simple and inarticulate way. To them he was the *Mahatma*—the great-souled man—and *Bapu*, their father; a man of high ideals who, they felt, loved them even to the point of being ready to sacrifice everything, even life itself, for their sake.

There was a time, first in South Africa and then in India, when Mr. Gandhi was a politician first and foremost, when he threw himself, with all that he was and all that he had, into the campaign for the political and social rights of his countrymen abroad, and later for the political independence of his own country, when he was the soul and leading spirit of the Indian National Congress. But for many years before his death he had withdrawn from active politics, leaving the field to younger men, and had been content to devote himself to the task of bringing his own caste co-religionists to undertake the improvement of the social status and living conditions of the so-called Untouchables. This hateful name he quite characteristically changed to Harijans, the children of the Lord.

But even when Gandhi had retired from active politics he was a power behind the scenes. Not only was he consulted on every major political issue, but such was his hold on the younger political leaders, and such his power with the people, that no one dared to initiate any policy which would clearly militate against his principles or meet with his disapproval. That is why his removal, even from a position behind the political scene, has left a dangerous vacuum. There is another side of Gandhi's character which has been but briefly adverted to (if at all) in the many obituary notices and appreciations which have appeared in

the press. His philosophy of life, in the religious and most other spheres, might roughly and conveniently have been summed up in the phrase "live and let live." Tolerance towards all and toleration for all. If he loathed and threw the whole weight of his powerful influence against oppression of any sort, against religious persecution and communal hatred and strife, he also set his face against religious proselytizing and Christian missionary work.

This attitude may in part have been due to a consideration of the possible political effects of conversions, especially if they were on a large scale. But what counted most with Gandhi, I think, was a conviction that the great religions of the world—Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, Christianity—were all equally good and useful inasmuch as they answered to the particular needs and aspirations, culture and outlook, of the people among whom they had taken root and flourished.

Gandhi had, it would seem, a high and sincere admiration for Christ and Christianity. But it should be noted that the Christianity he knew was Protestant Christianity. Christ was to him a paragon of men. The Bible, especially the Gospels, was a favourite book of his. He counted many Protestants among his friends and religious disciples and social collaborators, and several Catholics among his political disciples.

But in spite of all this it would have been impossible to break down his religious prejudices and persuade him that Christianity, because it transcended nationality, could find a natural home and a congenial environment in India. On the contrary, he would and did argue that Christianity belonged to the West and, for good or ill, had given a definite outlook, character and stamp to the West. That outlook and character did not, in his judgment, suit the mental background, tradition and genius of the East, or at any rate of India.

Gandhi professed to be a searcher for truth, in particular religious truth, and no doubt this profession was sincere. But his approach and his method in this search was not intellectual, as one might have expected, but rather experimental and experiential, even pragmatic. It was an approach of the heart rather than of the head. He could, and indeed did, show sweet reasonableness in his dealings with men; but somehow he fought shy of, and was inclined to mistrust or discount, a rational religious argument. Rationality and religion were, to his way of thinking, strange bedfellows. The essence of religion, he would have argued, is humility—humble prayer to, and reliance on, God, and a humble love of one's neighbour. An appeal to reason, he would have said, leads to pride, self-reliance, self-assertiveness: the West takes its stand on Reason and the syllogism; the East chooses the way of faith, and of the still small voice of conscience.

This is but one instance of Gandhi's sweeping generalisations, convenient though not necessarily correct, concerning the West. In season and out of season he made a strong plea for what may be called the simplicities of life—in the social, economic and political spheres no less than in the religious. And though his political disciples have, so to say, by-passed him on this issue, Gandhi himself was firmly convinced. And he lived up, moreover, to the conviction that making life more complex only made life more difficult for oneself, for one's country and for the world. It seemed to him that to make life more complex only multiplied men's needs and demands, and so brought it about, through a long series of causes, that either the individual, or the community, or an alliance of nations, would sooner or

later have recourse to force and violence in order to ensure the satisfaction of these desires and demands. It was in this connection that he pointed an accusing and condemnatory finger at the restless and warring West.

Gandhi's revolt—symbolic, yet also real and palpable—against the age of machinery, of science, of more complex organisation, of ever-increasing State control, of wholesale and indiscriminate destruction of life, property and material resources, was expressed in the *charka* (spinning wheel) and in the *khaddar* or coarse homespun of his loin cloth, in his diet of goat's milk, and finally in his policy of non-violence.

Friends and critics have not been wanting who have thought that Gandhi was a dreamer and visionary who belonged to, and desired, a past that will never return. Others of his friends and critics are of the opinion that he was a prophet a century ahead of his time. Be that as it may, it remains that Gandhi's character was rich, noble and many-sided, and so his life's work, too, had many facets. It cannot be said of him that whatever he set his heart on or turned his hand to became a shining success; but something much better *can* be said of him: that he had the rare and priceless gift, that belongs only to real greatness, of being able to inspire his associates and disciples with his own spirit of love, generosity and sacrifice; so that his tasks, at long last accomplished, bear the stamp of his great and good personality.

This is for the future. But here and now Gandhi has shown the way, and pointed to an instrument, for the achievement of tasks which face not India alone but the whole world. His life bears witness to the immense practical effectiveness of sheer moral and spiritual power. To-day, men do not set great store by this power; but they will always do so in times of overwhelming crisis, when the spirit of man is seen as the only bulwark which stands between them and irretrievable disaster.

EDWARD DE CRUZ.

CHRISTIANS AND THE ARAB LEAGUE

AN interesting development in Middle East Affairs is the *rapprochement* now taking place between members of the Arab League and the Vatican. Already this year has seen the Holy See entering into diplomatic relations with the Lebanon and Egypt; and a similar arrangement with Syria may, it is understood, soon follow. Last year rumour had it that the Arab League itself was anxious for the appointment of an Internuncio, whilst it is common knowledge that a Delegation of Palestinian Arabs has visited Rome to explain their views to His Holiness the Pope by whom they were sympathetically received.

Happenings such as these are of importance in many respects, and not least as a reminder of the existence of considerable Christian Minorities in the Arab States and Palestine. There is a widespread and erroneous idea that all Arabs are necessarily Mohamedans, and this sometimes leads to a notion that the Arab League is a Muslim threat aimed at the Christian world. In fact, while the majority of Arabs are certainly followers of the Prophet, there are among them considerable Christian minorities. This serves to explain the statement in Washington, by Abdul Rahman Azzam Pasha, Secretary General of the Arab League, that Pakistan, the new Moslem State of India, would not become a member of the Arab

League which was founded on *cultural*, and not religious, ties. Similarly, in the political field, many Christian Arabs are working whole-heartedly to assist the Arab League towards the attainment of its various aspirations, especially as regards Palestine. The three legal advisers to the Arab Delegation to U.N.O., at Lake Success, are all Christians, and there is probably no more ardent supporter of the Arab viewpoint than the Melkite Archbishop of Haifa and Galilee, the Very Rev. Mgr. Hakim, who not long ago paid a visit of ceremony to that exiled Moslem Arab leader, the Mufti of Jerusalem, in Cairo. Latterly His Grace has publicly declared that the Christian Arabs of the Holy Land, who number some 130,000, are firmly united with their Mohamedan fellow countrymen in opposition to Zionist pretensions. Over the border in Transjordania another Christian Prelate, Mgr. Bulos Sulman, Bishop of Aman, has stated that full co-operation exists between his flock and the Moslem majority under the wise rule of King Abdullah.

In the Lebanon, Christian influence is strong, both numerically and in the Government. A total population of around a million includes over 300,000 Catholics of the Maronite Rite. In Egypt, a pillar of the Arab League, Copts and other Orthodox Christians exceed a million, whilst Catholics total 250,000, of whom half adhere to the various Oriental Rites. Among these the Melkites, or Greek Catholics, are specially notable. They are wide-spread too in the Levant, and are found also among the two million Arab emigrants in the Americas, both North and South.

Negotiations are now going on in Egypt between the Moslem Government of King Farouk and the leaders of the various Christian Minorities over the vexed question of 'Personal Status.' In Egypt with its Mahomedan majority of some 15 millions, there may be some amount of anti-Christian feeling; but that it is not the official policy to foment such a tendency is shown by the present negotiations, in which the desire of the Government to treat the Minorities fairly seems to be evident. Only a short time ago the Papal Internuncio, in an interview with the newspaper "Al Misry," paid striking tribute to the toleration in religious matters to be found in Egypt. This, His Excellency said, might well serve to-day as an example to certain European countries.

The Egyptian Government itself has frequently stressed the advantages of unity among all the subjects of King Farouk, irrespective of creed. Such exhortations may be taken as calling for co-operation not only between Moslems and Christians, but also between the different Christian communities. And indeed a recent example of religious broad-mindedness, most creditable to all concerned, was seen in the Coptic Patriarch agreeing to withhold objections to the proposed approach to the Holy See, on the grounds that it was generally accepted that the presence of an official emissary at the Vatican would benefit the country as a whole. Even more far-reaching is the suggestion emanating from the Papal Internuncio himself, in the above-mentioned interview with the "Al Misry," that the leaders of Islam and Christianity should co-operate in resisting the evil of atheistical materialism which threatens the modern world.

Meanwhile it would appear very desirable to remember that the Arab states are the meeting place, geographically, of East and West; and also to recognize that if Christianity and Mohamedanism now exist side by side after centuries of conflict this is in great part due to the tolerant policies of Moslem Governments.

J.W.R.F.

II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES

An unexpected parallelism is discovered by Père A. Solignac, S.J., in an article in the January *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, between the ideas of some Existentialist writers and the doctrine of St. Augustine on the Fall and, in particular, on Death, Ignorance, and Feebleness in man as the threefold penalty of sin. Existentialist thought, according to the writer, is ancient, and forerunners of Kierkegaard include St. Bernard, St. Bonaventure, Montaigne and Pascal. The moderns have merely systematized the "intuition profond" of man confronted by his destiny and by death; and, one may add, have made the problem insoluble by dechristianizing it. The article contains a number of most interesting citations from St. Augustine. In the February number of this review A. Thiry, S.J., provides a careful summary of the recent encyclical *Mediator Dei* concerning the liturgy. He enters a useful caveat against those who interpret the encyclical beyond its intent in the matter of direct participation of the laity in *all* liturgical forms and prayers: "jamais on ne pourra, on ne devra exiger que la liturgie soit la forme *exclusive* de la piété collective" he cites from Guardini's "Spirit of the Liturgy"; adding, however, some words of Pius XI in an audience granted to a Benedictine liturgist (Dom Bernard Capelle): "We must imitate the Church and not forbid what she is willing to allow in the matter of prayer; but we must try to teach the Faithful, little by little, to pray as the Church does." Other articles in these two numbers of the *Revue* which should be of interest to English readers are "Pension au sein de l'Anglicanisme," by J. Hamer, O.P. (January) and "Noviciat ou Séminaire" by G. Courtade, S.J. (February). The former shows a better understanding of what Anglicanism really is than we have been accustomed to expect from the Continent, but the idea that the nominal episcopacy of the new South Indian Church will disrupt Anglo-Catholicism at home is most unlikely to be realized. The other article is about the direction of young men hesitating between religious life and that of the secular or 'diocesan' clergy; and while sympathetic with the urgent needs of the dioceses the writer warns against any weighting of the scales in what must be a matter of the conscience influenced only by the action of the Holy Spirit.

A brief but useful contribution to the long-drawn theological controversy on Natural Desire for God is made in the March *Clergy Review* by John Coventry, S.J. He suggests that it is the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas that man is endowed by nature with a vague, but in a sense limitless, inclination towards, and desire of good: without any clear knowledge of what object can satisfy that desire. This knowledge he can only acquire by the aid of divine grace. When, as a result of grace, he begins to desire expressly the vision of God, his desire becomes supernatural and meritorious. Without grace it must remain both vague and unsatisfied. The short article is written apropos of Dr. Bastable's recent work "The Desire of God"; it cites a pertinent passage from St. Thomas' *De Malo*. Both "The Prophet Zacharias in the Liturgy of Holy Week" by Fr. Charles Slaughter, and "The Magdalen" by Fr. Cuthbert Lattey, in the same number, are articles of considerable interest.

Fr. Stephen Brown contributes to the March *Studies* a very informative paper on Catholic lay activity in France. It is astonishing for example to learn that the Ligue Féminine d'Action Catholique numbers a little

over 2,300,000 members; its local libraries having 4,400 centres, its 'helping-hand' service hundreds of "little offices all over France," its work for advice and aid to mothers in religious care of their children and its information bureaux especially in the country districts, being staffed efficiently by voluntary workers. The countryside is, very rightly, a main objective now with French Catholic Action, and the Mouvement Familial Rural, with the Jeunesse Agricole Catholique, are doing much by attractive pamphlets and leaflets, to keep alive the old noble traditions of the French peasantry. Youth, of course, is another deep pre-occupation for apostolic Catholicity in France. The free schools cost the faithful 12 thousand million francs in 1947, and the money was found; while a great deal is being effected for youth outside the schools: the Scouts and Guides number three quarters of a million, and the Federation Sportive has a million members. Much of the current number of *Studies* is devoted to Irish history. Fr. Arthur Little continues his racy articles on the ancient philosophers with a paper about "Socrates and the Sophists."

The last three numbers of *Études* are full of good things. Social problems are considered in a study of the French strikes (January), in "Les Catholiques Libéraux et la Question Sociale du 1848" (Joseph Lecler, in February), while Gaston Fessard writes in the same number on "Soviet Philosophy and Philosophers according to Jdanov." The current number contains an article by René Savatier calling for the simplification and reform of local government in rural France. "A Theology of the Laity," is the subject of a paper, by Yves Congar, full of valuable ideas, which runs through the first two of these issues. Under the heading "Avis à nos abonnés de l'Etranger" *Etudes* prints the following notice: "Nous rappelons à nos abonnés d'Australie, Belgique, Canada, Congo Belge, U.S.A., Grèce, Islande, Hongrie, Luxembourg, Pologne, Suède, Suisse, Syrie et Tchéco-Slovaquie que les bureaux de poste de ces pays sont autorisés par l'Office des Changes à accepter le montant des abonnements aux Revues et à l'acheminer sur Paris." The absence of the name *Grande Bretagne* from this list makes one ponder again upon the implications and results of the literary iron curtain imposed by the Board of Trade in this country.

The *Gregorianum* for the last quarter of 1947 has for leading article an exposition, by Fr. R. Bigador, S.J., of the doctrine of Suarez on the nexus between theology and canon law, and the place and value of law in the Church's office. The article is directed against a tendency which the writer finds in some recent works on Canon Law by laymen, to regard it as something not essential, or even derogatory from the well-being of the Church. A. Sohler, A.M., considers the teachings of the 17th century Jesuit theologian, Gilles Estrix, on the nature of the Act of Faith. Estrix was an author whose work marked "le point culminant d'un courant d'idées brusquement freiné par la condamnation pontificale," the controversies he was engaged in involving the question whether faith could be lost without sin. Fr. M. Flick, S.J., writes on the supposition of the descent of mankind from more than one stock in relation to the Church's teaching on original sin. A lengthy 'note' of 24 pages is contributed by H. S. Lennerz "De co-operatione B. Virginis in ipso opere redemptionis."

REVIEWS

THE DEATH OF SOCRATES¹

WHATEVER may be the precise relation of the Platonic Socrates to the "historic" Socrates (the "Socratic problem" is incapable of definitive solution), it is Socrates as pictured by Plato who has come down to us not only as a turning-point in the development of Greek thought, but also as one of the great figures of European history. There can be little doubt that even if (as I believe to be the case), the metaphysical theory of Ideas is to be ascribed to Plato rather than to Socrates, the picture of the latter which is given in the Platonic dialogues represents what Socrates meant for Plato; the picture is the result of what Professor Guardini calls a contact, "the meeting with an historical figure which is unmistakably itself but yet represents something universally valid." One may admire Socrates and consider his life and death a blessing to European culture or one may, with Nietzsche, consider him a disaster; but one can scarcely deny his importance.

It is the story of the trial and death of Socrates which has especially captured the imagination of posterity. In the book under review Romano Guardini gives an interpretation of the Platonic dialogues, *Euthyphro*, *Apology*, *Crito* and *Phaedo*. His method is to supply a short introduction to the dialogue in question, and then to intersperse comments and explanations of varying length in the text. This method may not please everyone; but those who wish to read the complete text of the dialogues, unencumbered with interruptions, can easily find what they want elsewhere. We can be grateful to Father Basil Wrighton for his translation of Guardini's introductions and comments: if obscurity is sometimes met with, this is not to be attributed to the translator. (For the text of the dialogues the translation by F. J. Church has been employed.)

To see Socrates' death in its relation to the clash of different moral outlooks is the only way of perceiving the historical significance of the event. Hegel pointed out, in reference to the *Antigone* of Sophocles, that the tragedy involved not simply the clash between a devoted sister and an evilly disposed monarch, but also the confrontation of two moral codes, each embodied in a concrete personality; and the same is analogously true of the tragedy of Socrates' death. From a superficial viewpoint the philosopher was simply the innocent victim of a narrow-minded mob, worked on by its narrow-minded representatives; but though this is true as far as it goes, from a profounder viewpoint we can see in the opposing sides the confrontation of two epochs and two moral outlooks. As Guardini says, "in the incompatibility of these two opposing sets of values and forces lies the real tragedy of the situation." Socrates' rationalistic spirit (which was inspired by a sense of divine mission) was indeed a disrupter of the traditional mentality, a mentality which was by no means devoid of the perception of values (to that extent his adversaries saw correctly); yet his adversaries failed to see that the past was the past and that Socrates was no mere disrupter of the traditional moral, religious and political outlook,

¹ *The Death of Socrates. An Interpretation of the Platonic Dialogues: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito and Phaedo.* By Romano Guardini. Translated from the German by Basil Wrighton. London: Sheed & Ward. 1948. Pp. xiii, 177. Price, 10s. 6d. net.

but a champion of absolutely and universally valid moral principles and values, and a man possessed of a clearer perception of the nature of the divine than was afforded by the time-honoured myths of the city.

In so far as Socrates was the herald of a new epoch and his adversaries the upholders of a culture which was already in a state of transition, elements of inevitability and irony were not wanting in the story of his trial and death; but as every reader of the relevant dialogues is aware, Socrates was in a sense responsible for his own death. It was owing to his cavalier behaviour when it fell to him to propose an alternative penalty to that demanded by the prosecutors that sentence of death was actually passed, and even after it had been passed, Socrates might have availed himself of the opportunity of escape which was afforded him by his friends. Why, then, did he deliberately court death, especially when he realised that the execution of the sentence would bring an indelible stain on the city he loved? Apart, of course, from the fact that it was the condemnation rather than the ratification and execution of the sentence demanded by the prosecutors which brought a stain on the city, Socrates undoubtedly considered that by fully accepting the duty of obedience to the law, even when unjustly applied, he was meeting the claim of that absolute justice which was embodied, however, imperfectly, in the laws; and he thought that he was responsible to his fellow men for showing by example that fidelity to principle which he had always "preached." This is made abundantly clear in the *Crito*. But over and above the principle of obedience to law Socrates also wanted to make clear in practice his own attitude towards death. It is this theme which particularly interests Professor Guardini in the work under review.

In the *Apology* Socrates speaks of death as a good, but immortality is presented as a possibility, a hope, rather than as something which can be positively affirmed. In the *Phaedo*, however, it appears as something for which positive arguments can be given. Some of Socrates' "proofs" are by no means convincing; but I think that his answer to Simmias' suggestion that the soul is but the harmony of the body is a strong argument against epiphenomenalism. The soul can rule the body, and in this case it cannot be simply the harmony of the body. I do not see how one can escape from this argument except by affirming behaviourism, which is not a theory capable of withstanding criticism. As to immortality, Socrates' best argument is doubtless that from the soul's apprehension of the "Ideas", i.e., from the spiritual nature of the soul. In any case I think that Guardini is right when he finds in Socrates' assurance of immortality a religious element. The soul, drawn by love, can apprehend, even if imperfectly and in a transitory manner, the ultimate reality, the Good, and in that experience the assurance of immortality is contained. F.C.G.

NEW TRANSLATIONS OF THE "FIORETTI"¹

THERE must be many who are devoted to the legends about St. Francis, and to the *Fioretti* in particular, and yet sometimes ask themselves whether 'all this' can possibly be 'true'—who are in fact

¹ (1) *St. Francis of Assisi: The Legends and Lauds*; Edited, Selected and Annotated by Otto Karrer; translated by N. Wydenbruck. Pp. xvi, 302; Sheed & Ward: 1947. 13/- net. (2) *Les Fioretti de St. François d'Assise*. A new translation from the Milan 'incunabulum' by Fr. Godefroy, O.F.M., Cap., archivist of the Paris Province. Pp. xlix, 314. 1947. Price 200 francs.

vaguely aware that the historicity of much that was early written about the Saint has been strongly criticised, and none the less feel unable to make their way through the heavy volumes that have been compiled concerning St. Francis and his 'biographers' and have wanted something at once well-informed, reverent, and lovingly careful of the exquisite and fragrant stories that have come down to us. Otto Karrer's book ought richly to satisfy them. The editor has selected all that is most lovely from the original sources, and the translator has quite marvellously preserved its freshness.

At the same time, in his preface and in the Introductions to the various chapters, he provides not only a beautiful account of the Assisi of St. Francis's day, and an honest and therefore all too sad description of his turbulent times, but even a successful insight into the mentality of Francis's associates, friends and adversaries—and even (we risk saying) throws great light on the spiritual history of the Saint himself.

For we must never do Francis the injustice of romanticising him. He struggled for 'absolute poverty' and possibly even thought that this was the only adequate way of following Christ: he was intensely reluctant to allow his Little Brothers to study—and in both these cardinal matters he was defeated. His temptations were strong: his desolations were often black. He shared intimately alike in the sorrows and the serenity of one who is utterly incorporate into Christ. We are glad that the Editor pays so much attention to the writings of Brother Leo and his Companions: perhaps we are specially glad that he reveals to us better, maybe, than any other whom we have read, the elusive yet radiant features of St. Clare. He helps us to do what is so important in these matters—to distinguish true legend from false myth, and both from pedestrian history. And he protects us against the futile speculations, to which too many Franciscan devotees have laid themselves open, as to what Francis "would have been to-day," and use modern words like 'socialist' about a Saint who belonged totally to his own time, and totally to heaven.

The remarkable edition of the *Fioretti* prepared by Fr. Godefroy forms part of the series "La Renaissance du Livre," Marcel Daubin; 94 rue d'Alsia; Paris XIVE, and is well worthy of that series. The purely eruditional element in this examination of the true sources of the *Fioretti* demands a specialist competence which is not ours: but we think that all now admit that the collection had its origin among the 'Spirituals,' those early Franciscans who were hostile to those who sought privileges or mitigations from the Holy See and had, in a sense, Brother Elias for their patriarch. The introduction, which seeks to establish the pedigree of the *Fioretti*, may startle us by its gaiety—its vivacious development, throughout, of the metaphor of 'flowrets', and its frank recognition that some of these little blooms are exotics, and some even artificial. Changing the metaphor, Fr. Godefroy tells us (p. xvii) that the first 38 chapters of the *Fioretti* may be likened to a *roman de chevalerie*, a romance of Christ's knights-errant, starting indeed from history, but rapidly passing into 'legend,' and creating an 'atmosphere and a climate' where we must accustom ourselves to live.

The learned Capuchin goes so far as to say, on the one hand (p. xxxviii), that "the impartial reader will have been enabled to perceive that the *Fioretti* provide a document that is pre-eminently folklorist. Much good will is needed if we are to disentangle the historical elements therein; and so long as new discoveries have not come to widen our horizon, we

shall be forced to acknowledge that the problem of the Fioretti is far from having found its decisive solution." But he freely admits that though we cannot wholly refer to this our 'raccolta' for a "faithful portrait of St. Francis," we must have recourse, with due caution, to the Fioretti "for certain spiritual aspects of his temperament and of the primitive Franciscan movement which are not to be found elsewhere."

Moreover "the 'spiritual aspects' in question are to be viewed from the angle of Poverty. As for the 'primitive Franciscan movement,' it remains inexplicable if one does not seek its mainspring in this selfsame Poverty. On both these grounds the Fioretti constitute an irreplaceable testimony which will last as long as the world. Far from being 'condemned to fade,' the Little Flowers will always remain 'fresh though their stems be severed'" (p. xlix).

C.C.M.

THE RECORDS OF FATIMA¹

THIS book belongs to the "Science and Culture Series" (St. Louis University, U.S.A.) whose General Editor is the well-known Fr. J. Husslein, S.J., and we welcome the beautiful title 'Our Lady of Light' which corresponds so well with the description ultimately given by Lucia of her vision. We must not be taken as deprecating the appearance of the book if we say we wish either an exact translation of Fr. de Fonseca's work had been made, or better, that a wholly new book had been produced. For new material keeps accumulating; new points of view, new perspectives, are taken and made. And clearly without an exhaustive collation of the English with the French and the Italian, it is impossible to be certain where deviations may occur, and we think that Fr. De Marchi's *Uma Senhora* would have provided an even firmer basis on which to rest an opinion. Indeed, while the main lines of the story are well-known and do not change, lesser divergences seem to be becoming more frequent (I do not allude to mere 'decorations' meant to popularise the event). Thus lately we have seen it affirmed that the two children after whose fate Lucia enquired during the first apparition were boys, not girls. But she gave their names as Maria do Rosario and Amelia. We observe, however, that the statement that the latter was in Purgatory 'till the end of the world' is happily deleted. Unless we err, the triple apparition of a 'sheeted form' seen by Lucia and other young girls, which her mother said Lucia told her of as happening at about the same time as the triple angelic apparition to Lucia, Jacinta and Francisco, of which they said nothing, is not alluded to, though it is properly recounted in Canon Formigao's interrogatory of October 19th (De Marchi, p. 186). In the same interrogation occurs the puzzling affirmation, thrice made by Lucia and with emphasis, that Our Lady declared the war would end that day (October 13th): the Canon pointed out that it was still going on. How was that? Lucia said she did not know: all she knew was that Our Lady had said it would end on October 13th: *nao sei mais nada*. "There are some who assert that . . . Our Lady said it would end *soon*. Is that true?" "I said exactly what Our Lady said." When Our Lady said that if men did not repent, a worse war would break out in the next pontificate, (and

¹ *Our Lady of Light: The World-wide Message of Fatima*: translated (and abridged) from Canon Barthas's translation (and expansion) of Fr. G. Da Fonseca's *Le Meraviglie di Fatima*: Clonmore and Reynolds: 1947. Pp. viii, 215. 10s. 6d.

the French version declares in a footnote that the name of Pius XI is found in Lucia's note-book; the English version qualifies this by 'we believe': it reproduces however his assertion that *evidently* (*manifestement*) this alludes to the Spanish civil war. But this seems to me only a way of escaping the fact that the second World War is clearly intended and did not begin till the reign of Pius XII: it is not enough to say that the Spanish war was 'in certain respects' international and a prelude to the second Great War; and anyhow it was not worse than the 1914-1918 war. The English should not have reproduced Canon Barthas's assertion about the solar phenomenon of October 13th, that "suddenly, all who form part of this multitude, all without exception, have the feeling that the sun detaches itself from the firmament and, in zigzag leaps, is hurling itself upon them." Apart from the impossibility of discovering whether each and every one of a crowd of 50 or 60,000 saw the same thing (and indeed accounts differed not a little), the only reference, I think, to a zigzag motion was made 14 years later by a Fr. Pereira, then a missionary in India, who was a little boy at the time of the phenomenon, and some miles distant from Cova da Iria. The translation seems good, allowing for some condensation. We just note that on p. 45 we read: "A good lady has embroidered flowers on their veils" (those of Lucia and Jacinta). The French says: "A good lady . . . has woven, upon their veils, delicate garlands of artificial flowers." These were evidently wreaths, not embroideries. Such details are negligible. But believing, as we do, in the supernatural origin of the events at 'Fatima' and therefore in the 'world-wide' importance of its 'message,' we feel that it is imperative that the utmost caution should be shown lest what may *perhaps* be human accretions or misinterpretations should be confused with what is truly super-human. Not only do the Faithful deserve careful guidance in so delicate a matter, but problems, such as we have alluded to, are precisely what the unbeliever will pounce on and seek thereby to discredit the essence of the narrative. Meanwhile, any good book about 'private revelations' or mystical experiences provides norms for the discerning of what is 'given' to a 'seer' and what may be her own contribution. Not but what this is still very difficult in the case of Fatima, since ecclesiastical authority has forbidden the full publication of even those parts of Lucia's record, written at her bishop's bidding, which she considered could be revealed.

C.C.M.

SHORT NOTICES

At first we thought that the personality of Vittorino Rambaldoni (1378-1446), was rather obscured in this book *Vittorino da Feltre*, by P. Bosio Boz (Pia. Soc. S. Paolo, Alba. 1947. Pp. 187. Price not stated) by the mass of interesting information with which the author has surrounded it; but afterwards we felt that all of it was justifiably used. For the point of the book, you may say, is that Vittorino's time, *like ours*, was one of transition. Therefore it is right that we should be reminded of the medieval theories and practice of education, if only to see what innovations this great teacher made though never scornfully snapping the vital thread of tradition,

and how he led education into a new world without losing his head as too many of the humanists did. He had had a long and not very pleasant training at Padua and in Venice, and of all this we are given vivid pictures. But his great chance came when Gianfrancesco Gonzaga of Mantua, that enlightened tyrant whose military exploits and colossal accumulation of Papal privileges have eclipsed his genuine care for culture, summoned him to Mantua to educate his two sons which he did to such effect that Luigi, who succeeded in 1414, not only earned the grim title of *Il Turco*, but developed agriculture, had three printing-presses, welcomed in his palaces men like Platina, Poliziano, Mirandola, Mantegna, and actually received from Sixtus IV the Golden Rose reserved as a rule for royalty. Not for nothing had he been brought up in that *Giocosa* school which was created and developed by Vittorino on such good—shall we say, Hellenic-British lines? So perfect was the balance aimed at between body, intelligence, and spirit. As for the mind, we read the famous (perhaps apocryphal) sentence: "In dialectics, what has not been confounded by the British sophistries . . . ?" The old, true method of reasoning had been replaced by 'incongruous frivolities'—cavillings, vicious circles, disquisitions smart rather than sincere, double-edged questions, deceitful pseudo-conclusions . . . proper to the brains of Oxford and the Sorbonne, but not to be admitted now even as sharpeners of the wits. . . . "I want to teach (them) to reason, not to rave." There is a beautiful chapter on his relations with that wise and pious woman, Cecilia Gonzaga, and a host of other well-known personages; and a restrained description of his holy and humble death. He left practically nothing in writing—not, as maybe his solitary detractor has surmised, because he 'had nothing to say': his persevering activity reveals his mind better than any words. The last chapter is melancholy, so dark are the clouds that already brooded over Italy, indeed over Europe: and they are darker now. Alone the total Christian education will form right men, and "the concept of man's dignity make still stand firm"—his dignity, which is very different from pride.

The portrait on the cover of **A Torchbearer. Memoirs of Emily C. Fortey.** (Edited by F. P. Armitage. Blackfriars Publications. Pp. 92. 1947. 2s.), prepares us for finding a genuinely inspiring book, so full is it of 'character'—something that you seldom detect even in our political or social 'reformers,' and never, in those who have not first taken themselves in hand and have, by the grace of God, persevered. You see in her features both dignity, and humility; strength and tenderness; all those vanished qualities that used to make up what they called 'graciousness.' (Not but what Grace may revive them.) Her home and family possessed a wide culture: a mysterious attraction brought her into the Church at 18. It seemed at first as if she were destined to a brilliant career in chemistry research; but she abandoned this for social service and rescue work, having Leicester as her centre of activity. Perhaps no one has more perfectly combined a scientific understanding of such work, with the supernatural spirit which alone ensures any 'total' success. She joined the Labour Party and was very soon elected unopposed to the Leicester City Council. The subjects with which she dealt so competently and lovingly make a formidable list—the feeble-minded; birth control; women police; education, of course; best it is to read of how she was 'the friend of all' and very moving to hear of her war-work despite encroaching illness. Let me add that her determination to conquer her

fear of water led her to learn to swim when she was 70 ! A member of the Third Order of St. Dominic, she was in close contact with the Holy Cross Priory at Leicester and with Fr. V. McNabb in particular. We would like this little book—treasurable, though its arrangement is slightly confusing—to be read aloud in every school or convent, and by all who at least wish to know what work needs to be done in the modern world, and is done by all too few.

A layman whom long and affectionate familiarity with the Rule of St. Benedict has well fitted to present a commentary on the teaching and spirit of the saint has written **The Holy Rule for Laymen**, by T. F. Lindsay (Burns Oates. 1947. 7s. 6d.). The book takes the Rule by its main sections, rather than paragraph by paragraph, and gives its substance in the form of meditations on the principles involved, with many practical applications to everyday life. Not only is it made clear that the principles of religious life are those of the spiritual life in general, in whatever framework it is lived, but that Benedictine monasticism enshrines in a particular way the ideals of Christian family life. The author seems to have laymen rather than laywomen in mind, in his particular applications ; but there is much which will prove equally helpful to both.

The late Dom Germain Morin after long years among the manuscripts used to say that he had only to read through a text to be able to tell whether it was by St. Augustine or not. Those who are less practised will now be able to use a more scientific test, provided by a study of **The Clausulæ in the Sermons of St. Augustine** by Sister M. J. Brennan (Washington Catholic Univ. \$1.50). The fetters of metre, unnaturally imposed upon the Latin language, were working loose in the time of Augustine, and the matter of his cadences is here treated from the point of view of metre and also of accent. The text of the Sermons gives what Augustine actually said, taken down at the time by notaries, but how did he attune his voice to the words ? Is the ending *expediturus est* to be called a double cretic, or an example of the (accentual) *cursus tardus* or both ? Is it fair to say that it is either, until one is sure that Augustine either spoke an accentual Latin or gave value to metrical ictus in his speech ? Still, these statistical investigations are of use in confirming the conclusion of common sense : that Augustine, a trained rhetorician, even when he spoke extempore, was able to enrich his discourse with the graces of measured speech and beauty of cadence, giving more attention to the word-accent than to metrical prose-effects. Long before his day, in the poem *Pervigilium Veneris*, accent has supplanted metre ; how much more is this to be expected in the prose of an orator ? Those who share in the renewed interest in the Fathers of the Church will welcome the appearance of yet another learned accessory to their pursuit.

A valuable book is provided in **The Roman Ritual, Volume III—The Blessings**, translated and edited with Introduction and Notes by the Reverend Philip T. Weller. (The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. Price \$7.50). This is a handsome volume, beautifully printed in clear type and on good paper, giving the Latin in one page and the English translation on the opposite, with the rubrical directions in red lettering. The translator and editor has provided a very full introduction showing the significance of these Blessings of the Church in the material no less than in the spiritual world, and the place they ought to hold in the devotional life of both clergy and laity. Exception might be taken to some of the translations. On page 349, for instance, the words '*corporis sanitatem*

et animae tutelam percipiant' is rendered 'may perceive a help for body and protection for soul,' where for *perceive* it would be more accurate to write *receive* or *obtain*. On page 21 the words 'blessed old age' and 'eternal felicity' do not express the Latin words *optata* and *salutem*. In the well-known prayer to the Holy Ghost, 'Deus qui corda,' the words 'recta sapere' are translated 'to choose wisely,' which hardly gives the fullness of the Latin meaning. In spite of these and other shortcomings in translation, the book will be a welcome addition to a priest's library, and even the laity will find it of interest. Some of the latter may feel no little surprise at discovering that the Church gives her formal blessings to such diverse objects as "tools used in scaling mountains," fire-engines, railways, medicine, ale, silkworms, to mention only some of the things on which blessings may be invoked. In view of the sumptuous manner in which it is produced and of all that the book contains, running as it does to almost 500 pages, the price which in English money would amount to thirty-five shillings, cannot be said to be excessive.

Those interested in plainsong will find in *The Song of the Church*, by Marie Pierik (Burns Oates. 1948. Pp. xii, 274. Price, 21s.), a work packed with useful information about the Church's Liturgy and Chant. The author has evidently a close acquaintance with the sources and with the writings of experts. She makes no claim to be original. Her book seems to be the fruit of lectures given to pupils drawn from every walk of life, "from the Priesthood to the Prison," presumably in the United States of America. This is not an easy book to read. The subject matter does not always run logically, and the modes of expression are often curious. On page 59 occurs the following sentence: "Antiphons of Category I remount to the first organization of the Hours (about 440) and are the only kind that were used at the time when St. Benedict redacted his Rule (toward 530)." Other sentences have no verbs. On page 52 there seems to be an error in speaking of the Antiphon "O Lumen" (*sic*) of the Feast of the Purification; and in the illustration of secondary tonic Accents on page 243, the accents are not marked according to the accepted rules and appear to have become confused with the main tonic accents. On the whole, however, the book is creditably free from mistakes. It is extremely well annotated with numerous references. In the chapter on Hymnody—perhaps the best in the book—on page 143, the author does not seem to be aware of the strong case made out by Professor Powicke for Cardinal Stephen Langton's authorship of the "Veni Sancte Spiritus." In the next edition, the reviewer suggests, the rather obscure passages dealing with Rhythm (pp. 182, 183) could with profit be clarified, and the chapter about the Infant Church might be omitted as irrelevant. If this work suffer from some defects of language and arrangement, the writer certainly deserves to be congratulated on her immense industry in providing such a valuable mass of documented facts about Plain Chant.

"THE UNIVERSE"

The Leading Catholic Newspaper
merits your support.

It has faithfully and zealously served the Catholic Cause at home and abroad during the whole period of its long history 1860-1947. Its able editorials, Notes and Comments, powerful articles and unrivalled news service place it in the front rank of newspapers.

EVERY FRIDAY 2d.

Direct Subscriptions: 13s. Inland, or Abroad
per year. Inclusive of postage.

Special terms for members of His Majesty's
Forces: 10s. per year, inclusive of postage,
and *pro rata* for 6 or 3 months.

Head Office:

Field House, Breams Buildings, London,
E.C.4.

Prices net, postage extra

PRACTICE OF PERFECTION AND CHRISTIAN VIRTUES

*By Father Alphonsus Rodriguez, S.J. Translated from
the Original Spanish by Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J.*

Crown 8vo. Authorized English Edition complete in two volumes, 30s. per set; 16s. 6d. per single volume. Volume I.—Treatises i-xi, with portrait of author, pp. xviii + 878. Volume II.—Treatises xii-xxiv. With portrait of translator, pp. xvi + 688.

MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.

MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR YOUTH

(SIXTIETH THOUSAND)

With the approbation of the
Archbishop of Westminster and
of the Archbishop-Bishop of
Southwark.

This excellent prayer book, an especial favourite in Catholic Colleges and Convent Schools, was entirely re-arranged by the late Father Joseph Keating, S.J., in consultation with various spiritual Authorities. The manual has been described as truly manly and practical, and appeals to all whose piety is sincere, simple and devout.

Price, 4/- net cloth boards.

LONDON:

MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.15

SWORD OF THE SPIRIT

President;

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL GRIFFIN
Archbishop of Westminster.

The **Sword of the Spirit** was established
by Cardinal Hinsley in August, 1940

To unite Catholics in an understanding of
the spiritual issues arising from the war;

To emphasize the need for Christian
principles in social and international
reconstruction;

To call upon Catholics for more sincere
Prayer, for more serious **Study** of the
Church's teaching on social and public
questions, for more energetic **Action**.

The **Sword of the Spirit** Bulletin is published
every month. Price 6d.

Headquarters;—

12 CITY ROAD, LONDON, E.C.1.

TRIBUTE

to a great work being done through members

*"May I take this opportunity of sincerely thanking the
C.T.S. for helping a born Catholic to realise the tremendous
privilege which God has given him."*

This one of many instances which could be
quoted; one item from the vast collection of
evidence to the value of a work which is calling
for your support.

Write TODAY for details of membership.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY

38-40 Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1

THE MONTH

EDITOR REV. JOHN MURRAY, S.J.

THE MONTH was founded in July, 1864, to represent
the point of view and the claims of the Catholic Faith,
and it has continued to do so for more than eighty-three
years. The need to fight the battles of the Church in
English-speaking lands—a cause to which the periodical
is wholly consecrated—was never greater, and the Editor
ventures to hope that the support given to his efforts may
always continue and be extended.

PUBLISHERS Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd.,
London.

Annual subscription 20s. post free (U.S.A. \$4.50) should
be sent to the Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton
London, S.W.15.

THE CHRIST OF CATHOLICISM

A MEDITATIVE STUDY

By

Dom Aelred Graham

A Christological study of the first importance by a theological writer known on both sides of the Atlantic, in which a wholehearted acceptance of the dogmatic teaching of the "great Church" of Christendom, and the witness of the early Fathers does not preclude a sympathetic appreciation of such religious thinkers as Kierkegaard, Emil Brunner and William Temple.

2ls. net

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.

THE WESTMINSTER VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.
A New Translation from the Original Greek and Hebrew Texts. General Editors :
the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., Professor of Fundamental Theology at
Heythrop College, Oxon, and the Rev. John Murray, S.J., Editor of *The Month*.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN FOUR VOLUMES

- VOLUME I**—THE GOSPELS OF MATTHEW, MARK AND LUKE, by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Dean, D.D., Ph.D.
(CHRONOLOGY AND HARMONY OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST, by the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J.) 8vo. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- VOLUME II**—THE GOSPEL OF JOHN, by the Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, by the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J. 8vo. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- VOLUME III**—THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS (1st and 2nd), GALATIANS, ROMANS, EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS, PHILEMON and PHILIPPIANS, by the Most Rev. Alban Goodier, and Fathers Lattey, Keating, Keogh and Rickaby, S.J. 8vo. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- VOLUME IV**—THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, THE PASTORAL AND JOHANNINE EPISTLES, THE APOCALYPSE, THE EPISTLES OF JAMES, PETER AND JUDE, by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Boylan, D.Litt., D.D., Francis Gigot, S.T.D., and W. H. Kent, O.S.C. 8vo. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & Co., LTD., 6 & 7 Clifford Street, London, W.1